

although the heaviest cut has been made, of course, in the civilian ration. The French soldier now gets 21 ounces of bread instead of the 25 ounces he received at the beginning of the year. The civilian ration has been cut from the normal consumption of about 30 ounces to only 10 ounces.

In order to make even these rations available France has been compelled to stop brewing in order to save barley and to stop feeding of cereals to animals. This has resulted in a loss of 50 per cent of the horses and a large reduction in the number of cattle. Pastry making, fancy bread, confectionery, sandwiches, and all fancy uses of cereals have been absolutely suppressed.

Because of the shortage of cereals the French people have been compelled to kill off their cattle, and this has forced the consumption of meat instead of wheat to a large extent. In the meantime the consumption of other foods, such as sugar, rice, vegetables, oils, and fats, has been reduced by dire necessity.

This drastic food régime has borne with fortitude by the French people at a time when they have mobilized 7,000,000 men out of a population of 35,000,000 and have suffered a loss of nearly 1,000,000 men killed and 1,000,000 maimed.

Do Americans realize the full force of this information from the French commissioner? Do the citizens of this country individually feel that they are doing everything that in their duty lies to aid the lion-hearted ally that now holds two-thirds of the western front? Is each American thinking of the help that he might be giving to some heroic French soldier at the front or an equally heroic French woman doing a man's work in France?

France needs no cargoes of faith or courage from the New World. She needs no messages telling her to do her duty. She is not in need of sermons on patriotism. But she does need food. If Americans are heart and soul in this war, they will not see the army and people of France go hungry while there is food in the United States to share with them.

There must be fresh efforts in producing, saving, and transporting food to France. Americans must strive to picture the real conditions. They must sweep aside imaginary visions of easy victories over an intimidated and broken-down foe and face the brutal fact that America and France, with their allies, are fighting for life against a terrible enemy. France is on the burning line, side by side with the British nation, fighting with dauntless courage. American soldiers are joining them in rapidly increasing numbers. All of these fighters must be fed and equipped. The civilian populations that supply the armies must be fed.

The United States is not doing its full duty in the production and delivery of food to the allies. More acres should be planted and more strict methods of saving should be adopted forthwith. By the convoy system fewer vessels laden with food are lost than heretofore, which is a most encouraging factor. There is fair assurance that every vessel carrying food will arrive in France or England.

There must be more vessels carrying food. It is the vital necessity of the situation, the trumpet call to every individual citizen of the United States. Every person can help, either by planting or by saving. Not to help is to incur terrible risk now and hereafter.

Can Senators resist that touching plea to produce more food and thereby respond to the distressing cry of our noble associate in this war—France—for more food for her soldiers? Is it in your hearts not to hearken to that pitiful, soul-stirring plea for more food for the gallant French soldiers?

It was said some time ago that the motto of this war on our part should be "Ships, ships, ships." I would add to it "Food, food, food." Here is an appeal that I do not think should be denied or resisted by anybody who has the welfare of his country at heart. It is in your power to respond to this appeal, to provide an increased production of food by voting a liberal appropriation to this object and thus heartening and encouraging the people of the Flathead project to put in every acre available, every acre for which water is supplied, and to raise the biggest crop that they have ever raised in the history of the project. They are ready to do their share. Will you do your share?

As I have said, the Indian Bureau, the Reclamation Service, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Treasury, the House Indian Affairs Committee, and the House of Representatives have all asked for \$750,000 for this project for this year. The Senate committee allowed only \$250,000. I have made a motion to increase that amount to just \$500,000. I have not made my motion to increase it to the amount originally asked for by all departments of the Government that are concerned—\$750,000. I ask just to split the difference between what the Senate committee gave and what the House of Representatives gave. The House of Representatives gave \$750,000. The Senate committee gave \$250,000. I ask you, in the name of the suffering people on this project, in the name of American citizenship, in the name of our associates who are fighting in France for our lives and rights, in the name of all of this, just to go half way, just to split the difference and give this project \$500,000 this year. I believe it is a most reasonable request, a most just one. I believe that it ought to be granted. I believe there are good reasons for it; and if you have listened to my arguments and appeals I believe you will see that there is reason and justice in them.

I have nothing to say against the committee. I have much to say against its action, but nothing against the members of the committee. Doubtless the committee did what it thought was right; but I have presented to you facts, figures, arguments, and reasons which I believe ought to be persuasive and ought to convince you that the committee did not take the right view of the matter. Therefore I certainly hope that the Senate will

sustain my motion to raise this amount to \$500,000. It ought to be \$750,000. That pace was set year before last. There was every reason to hope and believe that it would be kept up until the project was completed; but I do ask you, in the name of justice, right, and the cause of our country, to give \$500,000 for this purpose. I urge that you do that much. I urge that my motion be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I inquire if the chairman of the committee expects to get a final vote on the bill this evening?

Mr. ASHURST. Oh, Mr. President, there is no hope of getting a final vote on the bill this evening, because there are other contested items.

Mr. WALSH. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these items may go over until to-morrow. I should like very much to have a vote on them and also to address the Senate very briefly on them, but I feel obliged to leave the Chamber now. I had supposed that possibly we would get a vote before this time.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. ASHURST. If no other Senator wishes to discuss the bill or any of the amendments relating to it now, I feel constrained to move to adjourn.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the request, Mr. President.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 25, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Bend low, O God, our Heavenly Father, and throw Thy protecting arms about us. Hold us close to Thee, lest we forget, in the terrible crisis through which the world is passing, the past, which is replete with the evidence that Thy providence has shaped and guided the destiny of men and of nations, and ever led them on to larger, grander civilization; that our faith and confidence in Thee may not be diminished one jot or tittle, for Thou dost live and reign, and time will vindicate Thy wisdom, power, and goodness.

Hear us, comfort, uphold, and sustain us, in this hour of trial, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 23, 1918, was read and approved.

### HOUSE RENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read a short letter to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to read a short letter to the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I should have said that I do not desire to read any names nor the location of the premises referred to. This letter is dated March 22, and is addressed to me:

DEAR SIR: The other day in speaking in the House you were reported in the papers to have cited the "Blank" case, but there was one feature of the case which I believe you did not mention and perhaps you did not know.

The facts as related here in the neighborhood are said to be: The former tenant was paying \$40 per month. He was ousted, and the house furnished and rented to 16 girls, 2 in a room, at \$10.50 each per month. That much I guess you already know, but the joke of the matter is that Mr. "Blank" or some one, has a sign on the front door naming the place the Merah, which, you will observe, is backward—the Harem. I wonder—Oh, well, what's the use? You go ahead and wonder.

I can vouch for the sign. I saw it not an hour ago. The rest is hearsay.

I don't want my name known, because I am a civil-service employee and mustn't talk.

Sincerely, yours,

This letter is signed, giving the street and number where the writer resides.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of

the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 121. An act to prevent the desecration of the flag of the United States, and to provide punishment therefor;

S. 3528. An act authorizing the President during the existing war to sell war supplies, materials, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States;

S. 3693. An act to prescribe the personnel of the Army Nurse Corps, the qualifications for appointment and the method of appointment therein, the pay, allowances, and leave of absence of members of said corps, and the conditions under which they may be retired;

S. 3863. An act to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases;

S. 3980. An act to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons by the United States, to provide a penalty for such interference, and for other purposes;

S. 988. An act providing for the payment of certain interest on items 1 and 4 of the judgment of the Court of Claims of May 18, 1905, in favor of the Cherokee Nation;

S. 3803. An act authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States in connection with or incidental to the prosecution of the war;

S. 3901. An act to amend section 8 of "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917;

S. 3736. An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relatives of any officer and enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct;

S. 4166. An act to amend section 3 of an act of Congress approved February 23, 1887 (vol. 24, Stats. L., ch. 210, p. 409), entitled "An act to provide for the execution of the provisions of article 2 of the treaty concluded between the United States of America and the Emperor of China on the 17th day of November, 1880, and proclaimed by the President of the United States on the 5th day of October, 1881";

S. 3691. An act to provide for reimbursement of actual expenses or flat per diem for enlisted men of the Army traveling on duty under competent orders; and

S. 3982. An act to suspend certain restrictions on the purchase and distribution of military stores and supplies, and for other purposes.

#### ADDITIONAL SECRETARIES OF WAR.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9352) creating two additional Secretaries of War, and that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. KAHN.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF A MOTION.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion previously made by me to discharge the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures from further consideration of House bill 2878.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to withdraw the motion previously made by him to discharge the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures from further consideration of House bill 2878. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman why he introduced the resolution? It stirred up considerable of a fuss.

Mr. TILSON. The bill is all right. It should be considered by the gentleman's committee, which should not be discharged from consideration of it. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion, although I do not anticipate that there is any danger of the motion being granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS OPEN TO ENTRY.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. In 1916 Congress enacted legislation disposing of certain lands which were formerly a part of the Oregon and California land grant in Oregon. Since that time many Members of the House have inquired of me when these lands would be listed for entry. The act of June 6, 1916 (39 Stats., 218) required the Department of the Interior to make the necessary examinations to determine the agricultural areas and to cruise the timber on the land. They have completed now a large proportion of that work. On March 23, last Saturday, the department opened 300,000 acres of this land to homestead entry. Filings may be made beginning on the 29th of April and ending on the 25th of May. Persons interested may obtain, after April 5, from the land office at Roseburg, Oreg., a description of the particular areas so opened and the regulations under which the land may be entered. All entries will be considered to have been made simultaneously, and those living near the land will not have any advantage of anyone living at some distance from the land. If two or more persons make entry for the same tract, a drawing will be held to determine which one shall be entitled to the tract.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the statement furnished me by the Interior Department.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. These lands are to be entered at what price?

Mr. HAWLEY. At the price stated in the act, the basic price of \$2.50 an acre, but all they need to pay at first is 50 cents per acre and the ordinary filing fees.

Mr. CANNON. What are these lands worth for the timber?

Mr. HAWLEY. These are agricultural lands, not timber lands.

Mr. CANNON. Agricultural lands?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; 300,000 acres of agricultural lands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Office of the Secretary, March 23, 1918.

Secretary Lane, of the Department of the Interior, has just approved regulations opening to entry under the homestead laws, as modified by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat., 218), about 300,000 acres of land classified as agricultural, situated principally in Jackson and Josephine Counties in southern Oregon. These lands are a portion of what are commonly known as the Oregon and California Railroad land grants, title to which was resumed by the Government under the act of June 9, 1916. The agricultural lands opened to entry at this time are by no means all of the agricultural lands in the grant. Additional agricultural lands in the grant will be restored to entry from time to time as the classifications are completed.

The classification as agricultural does not necessarily imply that the lands are suitable for the plow. The law under which the classification was made directed that such lands be separated into three classes: First, those valuable for power sites; second, timber lands, including those containing 300,000 feet, board measure, of timber to a tract of 40 acres; third, agricultural lands, those not falling within either of the other two classes. Large areas so restored are covered with brush or varying quantities of timber less than 300,000 feet, board measure, to the 40-acre subdivisions, and some are valuable only for grazing.

Applications to enter any of the lands thus restored may be filed by any duly qualified person for a unit of 160 acres or less in the United States land office at Roseburg, Oreg., at any time during the period beginning April 29 and ending May 25. All applications filed during this period will be considered as filed simultaneously. Persons filing at or near the end of the period will have the same opportunity as those who file at the beginning. In case of conflicting applications for the same land, a drawing will be held on May 28 to determine the successful applicants.

Applications to enter must be sworn to before the register or receiver of the United States land office at Roseburg, Oreg., or before a United States commissioner or judge or clerk of a court of record within the county in which the land is situated. Each application must be accompanied by the required land-office fees, together with an amount equal to 50 cents per acre to apply on the total purchase price of \$2.50 per acre, the balance of \$2 to be paid at time of final proof. Applicants must personally examine the land.



Any person who served for more than 90 days in the United States Army or Navy during the Civil War, Spanish-American War, or the Philippine Insurrection, and was honorably discharged, may file a soldier's or sailor's declaratory statement through an attorney in fact on the ground and make his application to enter within six months thereafter, but such declaratory statement must be accompanied by the fee of \$3 and the installment of purchase price required of other applicants. A pamphlet containing the regulations and a list of the lands, with a brief description thereof, will be mailed after April 5 to those requesting same from the register and receiver of the United States land office at Roseburg, Ore.

Mr. RUCKER. Can the gentleman give us approximately the value of these lands for agricultural purposes? Can he give us some idea of the value?

Mr. HAWLEY. If a tract of 160 acres contains less than 1,200,000 feet of timber, board measure, it is classed as agricultural land. Doubtless there will be a number of quarter sections which have nearly the limit of timber upon them, and such lands will have an agricultural value when the timber is removed. The timber also covers only a portion of each quarter section. The other quarter sections will be agricultural lands, and some of the land will be very valuable for agriculture and some will not be so valuable. It varies so much from locality to locality that it is impossible to make any statement as to average values.

#### ALIENS NOT QUALIFIED VOTERS IN OREGON.

While I am on my feet I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Hon. George M. Brown, attorney general of Oregon, replying to a statement made on the floor of the House to the effect that aliens may vote in the State of Oregon and quoting the statute in regard to the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the opinion of the attorney general on the subject stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,  
LEGAL DEPARTMENT,  
Salem, March 12, 1918.

Hon. W. C. HAWLEY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have observed a press dispatch of the 11th instant from Washington to the effect that enemy aliens would be denied the right to vote for President, Vice President, Senators, or Representatives in the 10 States where they now enjoy that privilege under provisions of a bill introduced to-day by Representative FLOOD, of Virginia, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. The article states that "after declaring intention to become citizens aliens may vote in Alabama, Arkansas, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Oregon, South Dakota, and Texas."

This is an error so far as applied to the State of Oregon, and an error that I have been called upon to correct a number of times since the declaration of war.

Section 2 of article 2 of the constitution of the State of Oregon was submitted to the people of this State at the election held November 13, 1914, and was amended to read as follows:

"In all elections not otherwise provided for by this constitution every citizen of the United States, of the age of 21 years and upward, who shall have resided in the State during the six months immediately preceding such election shall be entitled to vote."

There were 164,897 votes cast for the article as amended and 39,847 against.

Prior to that time section 2 of article 2 of the constitution, before it was amended, extending the right of suffrage to women, read as follows:

"In all elections not otherwise provided for by this constitution every white male citizen of the United States, of the age 21 years and upward, who shall have resided in the State during the six months immediately preceding such election, and every white male of foreign birth, of the age of 21 years and upward, who shall have resided in the United States one year and shall have resided in this State during the six months immediately preceding such election and shall have declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States one year preceding such election, conformably to the laws of the United States on the subject of naturalization, shall be entitled to vote at all elections authorized by law."

At the election of November 5, 1912, said section was amended so as to admit of woman's suffrage, and read as follows:

"In all elections not otherwise provided for by this constitution every citizen of the United States, of the age of 21 years and upward, who shall have resided in the State during the six months immediately preceding such election, and every person of foreign birth of the age of 21 years and upward, who shall have resided in this State during the six months immediately preceding such election and shall have declared his or her intention to become a citizen of the United States one year preceding such election, conformably to the laws of the United States on the subject of naturalization, shall be entitled to vote at all elections authorized by law."

Very truly, yours,

Geo. M. Brown,  
Attorney General.

#### HOUSE RENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I hand to the Clerk's desk a letter, with my answer thereto, to be read in my time for the benefit of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read, without objection.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

I wish to file the following answer to a charge of cruel behavior as a "would-be profiteer" preferred against me by Chairman JOHNSON on the floor of the House yesterday, said charge based on a communication he had received from a former tenant of mine.

In the first place, let me state that the house in question is 521 Rock Creek Church Road; that it is the only house I own in the District of Columbia; that it was built for my own private home; and that I occupied it until I had occasion to leave the city, at which time I stored my furniture and placed my house on the market for rent. Mr. De Pue rented my house unfurnished in April, 1915, at a time when there was but little demand for houses, and he only paid me \$40 per month for a nine-room, semidetached house, with all the latest modern improvements, a house which I could not build to sell to-day under \$9,000. Mr. De Pue had the advantage of this low rent for a period of over two and one-half years at this price. When the situation for houses became acute I was persuaded by Mrs. E. L. Hollis, of New York City, to furnish my house in such a manner as to comfortably accommodate 14 to 16 ladies. The house is now occupied by the following ladies:

[Names omitted.]

These ladies inform me that they are paying the rent on a cooperative basis at an average cost of \$10.71 each per month, and they further inform me that their salaries are \$1,100 and \$1,200 a year each. They have also expressed their willingness and their desire to be interviewed on this matter as to the fairness of the rental charges, and I rest my case on the testimony they may give.

In regard to the charges made by Mr. De Pue, I will state that when I decided to make the change I gave Mr. De Pue the regular 30-day notice, upon receipt of which he came to my office and in the presence of a witness made certain threatening and abusive statements to the effect that he would not move; that he had employed a good attorney; and that he was sure I would not get him out under six months; and that he would give me all the trouble he could. He made no mention of any old lady or any member of his family who was not able to move.

Finally, in defense of these charges preferred against me, I respectfully urge that you have a committee appointed to interview these ladies, and I am willing to abide by their testimony.

I was born in a log cabin in the mountains of old Virginia. I have been actively engaged in general contracting and building in this city for the past 14 years; and until this time I have never been accused of any transaction that was not fair and legitimate.

I think the above a fair example of what can be done under my plan of fixing rent on a per capita basis, and no hardship would be experienced by anyone.

Respectfully submitted.

GUY S. ZEPP.

MARCH 22, 1918.

Mr. GUY S. ZEPP,  
Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your circular letter (without date) relative to the letter written to Mr. JOHNSON by Mr. De Pue.

I have seen the De Pue letter, and it contains four principal statements, as follows:

- First. That he had rented your house at \$40 a month;
- Second. That you put him out, demanding more rent;
- Third. That his invalid mother was put out with him; and
- Fourth. That you increased the rent from \$40 a month to \$140 a month.

Now, in your circular letter you admit all that Mr. De Pue says in his letter, except that you did not know that Mr. De Pue had an invalid mother in the house.

However, your lack of knowledge of that fact does not contradict the remaining fact that he did so have an invalid mother.

In your circular letter you say there are now 14 ladies in the house, and that the rental is divided equally among them and that each pays \$10.71 per month. Fourteen ladies paying \$10.71 each makes a total of \$149.94 per month. Therefore the statement of Mr. De Pue understates the rental you are charging rather than overstating it, and the fact is thereby admitted by you that you have increased the rent of the house from \$40 a month to \$149.94 a month.

You place your emphasis upon your assertion that the house was built for your own use. From that it seems you feel that you should charge working girls more for the honor of living in a house built for yourself than if it had been built for somebody else.

In your communication you take \$9,000 as the value upon which you base your rentals, while, on the other hand, the house and land are valued at \$4,668.30 for taxable purposes. Therefore you value the property for rental purposes at almost double its value for taxable purposes. At the rate for which you are now renting the property the rent for three and three-fourths years would pay for house at the value at which you are giving it in to the assessor for taxable purposes.

In view of these facts, I am compelled to entertain the opinion that you have driven a hard bargain with the working girls who are now occupying your house.

Very truly, yours,

WM. J. CARY.

#### DELIVERY OF SOLDIERS' MAIL TO FRANCE.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I brought to the attention of the House, not for the first time, the delays in the Postal Service to our soldiers in France. In this morning's mail comes rather an interesting illustration of the condition to which I referred. I hold in my hand two envelopes, both addressed to a major general commanding one of the divisions of the American Expeditionary Forces. One of them was postmarked in Washington December 13, and the other was postmarked in Washington December 31. Both were delivered to the addressee in France on February 24. In one case the time in transit was 73

days, and in the other case the time in transit was 52 days. The letter which transmitted the envelopes back to me required just 28 days in transit; so that the slower of the two round trips consumed 101 days from Washington back to Washington. Civilians are able to get a reply to their letters in 35 days for the round trip. Why should it take three times as long to a major general or to a private in the American Expeditionary Forces?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing therein a letter from the adjutant general of the State of New York showing the enlistments in our State National Guard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### INCREASED PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414, with Mr. CARAWAY in the chair.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, is there an amendment pending?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I was about to inquire if the motion was not on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. Cox].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Cox: Amend by striking out the following language, line 1, page 2: "after the passage of this act," and insert the words "during the fiscal year, 1919."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, is this subject to amendment at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. CANNON. Then I would like to make the pro forma amendment and be heard for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the pay of the postal employees ought to be increased, and I stand ready to vote for an increase. I have not had the privilege of listening to the debate upon this bill, for I have been otherwise engaged on a conference by the order of the House, so that I have not kept up with the debate. I just asked a gentleman what would be the cost of this increase, and he said from forty to fifty million dollars. I asked how many of the civil employees there were outside of the Postal Service, and he said 265,000 as against 145,000 in the Postal Service. I then asked, so far as the increase in salaries was concerned, how this bill corresponded with the other increases that we have made from time to time from one fiscal year to another. If I understood him correctly he said about double. I have not had the opportunity to investigate to see whether the increase ought to be made as reported by the Post Office Committee; but I want to say that I have a large number of these employees in my district—not as many as in the great cities, but I have a district that is 150 miles long and 25 to 30 miles wide. I think it has more railroad trackage in it than any district in the United States. There are many cities in it; one is hardly ever out of sight of an elevator stack, and it is very thoroughly organized into rural-carrier districts. I have nothing to say against the Government employees. No doubt they are worthy and perform good service. It is true that under the present wage the increased cost of living is felt very much, and in God's chancery they ought to have an increase in their pay. I am not going to discuss the question of whether this is too much or whether it is too little. I notice an amendment was agreed to in committee in effect striking out the provision that this increase was to be paid until the close of the war and that an amendment was accepted striking out the words "during

the war" and inserting the word "hereafter," so as to make it permanent law.

I am going to vote against that amendment in the House, because if we make this permanent law after the war all along the line for these civil employees—and there is double the number of them outside of the postal employees—we will make a very great increase. You may say that the increase in the cost of living is because of the decrease in the purchasing power of money. In many cases money does not buy half what it did buy before, and I think probably one might well say that there has been an average advance in the cost of living of probably 20 to 25 per cent. That is not a close estimate. What is going to happen when the war closes? Congress will be in session, though I am afraid that I shall not be here—not that I have no desire for further service in Congress, but from present conditions I fear this war is going to last so long that the probabilities are three to one that I shall have crossed over and joined the great majority before its close. Now, when it is over, let us not fool ourselves. We will come back under normal conditions, competing with the world in production. We will come back to 70-cent wheat, instead of \$2.50 wheat. We will come back to 7 and 8 cent a pound cotton, instead of 30 cents a pound for short staple and 40 cents for long staple. We will come back to 30 and 40 cent corn, and other things in proportion. We will come back to all the necessities of life greatly reduced in price. Now, if that is so, if I am correct about it—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes additional.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of five minutes, to be occupied by the gentleman from Illinois, that all debate close on this amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MADDEN. I move that all debate close on this amendment at the end of five minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I desire to offer a preferential amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the unanimous consent should first be disposed of. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the gentleman from Illinois have five minutes additional? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that at the end of five minutes all debate on the pending amendment close.

Mr. MOON. Let the gentleman from Illinois complete his speech first.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, now it will be a pretty serious matter. The committee, of which I am a member, now has a conference report that will come up for consideration, and the authorizations and appropriations in that conference report are substantially a billion one or two hundred millions—I am not exactly accurate. That can be stated a little later. Mind you, this is a deficiency for this fiscal year ending the 30th of June next, and there is another deficiency bill to follow. We are financing our allies. We are raising and preparing an Army and a Navy. Oh, none of us can conceive of the extraordinary expenditures we are making and will continue to make until this war closes. Now, as near as I can find from a little consultation, I think that this bill makes sufficient increases. It classifies the service and provides for promotions and all that kind of thing, and I believe we ought not to set an example now of taking a departure from the course which we have heretofore followed.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know how much the bill would cost the Government, as it is now prepared, up to the 30th day of June, 1919?

Mr. CANNON. I do not—

Mr. COX. I have those figures.

Mr. CANNON. I asked a gentleman who is pretty well informed, and he said certainly from forty to fifty million dollars.

Mr. COX. I have the figures prepared by Mr. Koons, of the Post Office Department, whom I regard as one of the best-informed men on this question, and he figures out it will cost \$60,000,000 to pay this bill up to the 30th day of June, 1919. Now, another question: Does the gentleman know how much it will cost if we will pay the Post Office employees on the identical basis that we pay all Government employees as fixed in the legislative bill?

Mr. CANNON. No; I do not.

Mr. COX. As prepared for me by the Post Office Department this morning, up to June 30, 1919, it would cost \$18,613,150. The difference between that figure and \$60,000,000 if this bill becomes a law as it is now prepared.



Mr. CANNON. I have made up my mind not to be bound by it; but I apprehend I shall vote for this bill, provided the amendment of my good friend and colleague, for whom I have great respect, inserting the word "hereafter" is not agreed to when we come into the House. Gentlemen may say the postal employees will fight us unless we vote to make this permanent law. I do not believe the postal employees desire any greater per cent of increase than other employees of the Government receive.

Then when the day comes and all products go down from 25 to 50 per cent—agricultural products cut in half—Congress will take care of that when the time comes. I have passed through the period of the Civil War. My God, I recollect what a revolution there was when corn went down to 15 and 20 cents a bushel and the populists abounded and demagogues abounded, and, if you will allow me the expression, hell was to pay and no pitch hot. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MOON and Mr. AUSTIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman later.

Mr. AUSTIN. The trouble is that recognition of the gentleman from Tennessee cuts me off now.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move as an amendment to that, that debate close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia moves to amend the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee by making it 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the question occurs on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that debate on this amendment do now close.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Cox: Amend by striking out the following language in line 1, page 2: "After the passage of this act," and insert "during the fiscal year 1919."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], a member of the committee, offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "grade," insert the following:

"Provided, That on the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service who are in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, under the act of March 2, 1907, as amended, shall pass automatically from such grades and the salaries they receive thereunder to the new grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, with the salaries provided for such grades in this act."

"Provided further, That all promotions of both clerks and carriers shall be made at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of one year's service in the next lower grade."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word in explanation of this.

Under the classification act of 1907 it was provided that there should be six grades. The first grade was \$600, the second \$800, the third grade \$900, the fourth grade \$1,000, the fifth grade \$1,100, and the sixth \$1,200. In 1913 the Congress amended the act by the elimination of the first grade, cutting out the \$600 compensation. That left but five grades. The first of the five grades under the law as amended would be grade 2, but everybody has understood grade 2 to mean grade 1, the entrance grade. And in the preparation of the legislation so far it has always been understood that the man in what is legally called the second grade, but technically the first grade, was in the first grade; that when we created the new grades and the new compensations it was always understood that the man in what we understood to be grade 1 would pass to grade 1, with a \$900 salary instead of \$800 salary; the man in grade 2 would pass from \$900 to

\$1,000 salary; the man in grade 4 would pass to grade 3 in the new compensation salary; and the man in grade 5 would pass to grade 4; and the man in grade 6 would pass to grade 5, so that there would be a \$200 increase for the man in the \$800 grade, a \$200 increase for the man in the \$900 grade, a \$200 increase for the man in the \$1,000 grade, and a \$200 increase for the man in the \$1,100 grade, and a \$200 increase for the man in the \$1,200 grade. That would leave one grade for which we make no provision except that we fix the salary. Under the present law that has been the practice. We began by leaving the top grade out of consideration, except in so far as the Congress appropriated money for it from time to time, and to-day we are appropriating for 85 per cent of the men in the grade below the sixth grade. And so this amendment that I propose will give the men a uniform increase of \$200 in their compensation, no matter what grade they are in.

And we leave for the Congress the right to appropriate for such percentage of the men in the next lowest grade to the highest grade, namely, the sixth grade, as they may think proper from time to time. I think this is what everybody understood we were trying to do. If we do the thing that the provision already adopted would provide, the last promotion would mean a \$300 advance. And the Post Office Department and a great many men outside of the Post Office Department think that that would impose too large a burden upon the Treasury. And in talking with the men who are interested, and most vitally interested, in this subject, they agree that this amendment will cure the opposition, deal fairly with the question, give the men what they expected to get, and certainly do in this bill what I expected I was doing from the beginning.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not understand all this talk about grades, but what I would like to know is this: A carrier in my town now gets \$1,200—

Mr. MADDEN. And will get \$1,400 if this bill becomes the law.

Mr. SNYDER. Will in the future get \$1,400?

Mr. MADDEN. And later on will get \$1,500.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Why not make it permanent?

Mr. MADDEN. It is supposed to be.

Mr. HAMLIN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question simply for information, as I do not know of anybody better from whom to make the inquiry than the gentleman from Illinois. Here you have a first grade with salary at \$1,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir. The man that gets \$800. That goes up to \$1,000.

Mr. HAMLIN. What is the present grade?

Mr. MADDEN. Eight hundred dollars. That is the second grade now, but should be classed grade 1, as the grade below was abolished in 1913.

Mr. HAMLIN. You have made one new grade?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. And that is grade 1?

Mr. MADDEN. That is grade 1. We had grade 1 under the law, but we abolished the salary connected with it in 1913.

Mr. HAMLIN. So that you have horizontally increased all of these \$200 as they go from one grade to another?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAMLIN. Suppose a man is now in the fifth or sixth grade. Under the present law what grade would he be in under this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. The amendment provides that if he is in the sixth grade he goes into the fifth grade.

Mr. HAMLIN. He goes down?

Mr. MADDEN. Down in grade but up \$200 per annum in salary.

Mr. HAMLIN. Suppose he draws the sixth-grade salary?

Mr. MADDEN. Under the present law he draws \$1,200, and under the new bill he will be drawing \$1,400.

Mr. WALSH. There is nothing to prevent the department, however, from demoting these men after they pass into the upper grades, so that they will get the salary they were getting before.

Mr. MADDEN. They can not do it.

Mr. WALSH. It is being done.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of discipline, of course, it is.

Mr. WALSH. Not as a matter of discipline at all.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand it, the employees pass from one grade to the other annually?

Mr. MADDEN. They pass after they have served in the grade one year if they qualify, whether it is the beginning of the year or the beginning of the quarter.

Mr. DOWELL. But they must serve where they are now under this provision?

Mr. MADDEN. They pass automatically to the new grade now if they have been in the grade long enough—one year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more, so that I may ask him a question.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes. I desire to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MOON. If I understood the gentleman from Illinois correctly, this is a modification of the amendment that has already been adopted by the House?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOON. Now, what is the decrease involved in it?

Mr. MADDEN. It would confine the man at present in this grade to a \$200 increase, whereas the amendment already adopted, if strictly construed and executed, would give him a \$300 increase.

Mr. MOON. That was my understanding of the amendment and of the purpose when the gentleman spoke to me about it, but some gentlemen thought that it did not accomplish that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. It does, absolutely.

Mr. MOON. It strikes me that it does.

Mr. MADDEN. It absolutely accomplishes the purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois repeat again what he said about the \$600 employee?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. In 1907 Congress classified the clerks and carriers. It made these grades. The first grade had a salary of \$600, and the second a salary of \$800.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, the \$600—

Mr. MADDEN. In 1913 Congress modified the law by striking out the \$600 grade and making \$800 the entrance salary, but did not change the number of the grade.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. None of these employees now get \$600?

Mr. MADDEN. No; \$800 is the lowest. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to understand the parliamentary situation. As I understand the purpose of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], he wishes to withdraw the amendment that was voted on the other day—the amendment that he offered—and to substitute this amendment in its place. I am not certain whether that is the purpose of the gentleman or not, but I believe it is.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to do it in the most expeditious way and least complicated, if necessary. If necessary I want to ask unanimous consent to vacate the former proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks to vacate the amendment adopted on Friday after the motion to strike out and insert.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, that is the point I was trying to call to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois—to strike out and insert.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike out and insert.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman will be so modified, without objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I very much hope that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois will prevail. I am very glad to see the committee in a temper where it is willing to submit by unanimous consent to a proposition that looks toward some measure of economy at least. I hope the members of the committee will consider very thoughtfully certain of the amendments that have already been adopted before we reach the point at which we shall vote upon them in the House itself, because to my mind a mistake has been made in adopting certain amendments that have been proposed.

I appreciate the equities that exist; I appreciate the conditions that exist in the country, which render it not only entirely equitable but necessary to grant some increases in compensation to the employees dealt with in this measure, to the end that they may meet the high scale of prices that now exists for those things that are necessary to life. But, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely impossible for me to understand how intelligent

business men should insist upon taking a position which is abnormal economically and making that the basis for permanent legislation.

I heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] read the other day, when he presented his first amendment, a letter from the President of the United States, and invoked the sentiment therein expressed as being a basis for the support of that amendment which he was then proposing, when the whole tenor of that letter of the President was devoted to emphasizing the thought that conditions are to arise in the future and with which men must then deal.

Yet what are we here doing? We are fixing a scale of pay that we believe to be fair under conditions that now exist. We know that those conditions will change when the war is over. We know that there is not going to be that continuation of inflation in prices. We know that the expenses of the rural carrier and other postal employees are not going to be so great after this war is over as they are now.

I come from a district where most of the postal employees are rural carriers. Is it fair, is it right, is it good business policy, to take this abnormal condition which now exists and make that the basis of pay for all time to come, no matter what change in conditions may arise? "Oh," gentlemen say, "it can then be changed." It will not be changed. The same influences that now drive it into permanent law will prevent it from being repealed when the time shall come. Whoever heard of decreasing a Government salary?

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the equities that exist in the case of these employees. I am in sympathy with the purpose. I reported the rule from the Committee on Rules that made this in order. I should have hesitated long to support such a rule if I had thought the bill was going to be made the basis of permanent legislation.

There are some other people in the country besides the postal employees. Many interests must be considered, many sacrifices made, and all must share in these sacrifices. I have heard from the rural carriers in my district to some extent. There is not nearly so much dissatisfaction expressed among them as some gentlemen insist. I realize that there ought to be an increase, and I favor it. But I have also heard from some others in my congressional district, who have something to do with the paying of the bills. They are willing that the postal employees shall have a fair wage and a just pay at all times, but they are not willing that we should take an abnormal condition and make it the basis of permanent law. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to support this legislation, but I am inclined to agree with the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee] that if we start in upon this basis of making these increases permanent, we are going to arrive at a point before this Congress concludes its labors for this session where we will be astounded at the effect of this legislation upon the Treasury of the United States.

I have favored a reasonable increase for all Government employees during the present war emergency, but I doubt if these increases which have been voted into the bill can be termed "reasonable" under all the circumstances, and I doubt the wisdom of making them permanent. I do not believe it costs a letter carrier or a clerk any more to live than other Government employees in the same section of the country. I believe, as I have said, that the postal employees are entitled to an increase in their compensation. Why they should get any extraordinary increase over and above employees in other branches of the Government service I have yet to learn. There is one thing, however, that I do wish to say, in justice to the postal employees, and that is that, in my opinion, they have at the head of their establishment at the present time an official who seems to be obsessed with the idea that he is conducting the Post Office Department of this Government on the theory that it is his duty to see to it that he returns a profit to the United States as a result of his conduct of its affairs, and in many instances and in perhaps nearly every instance of radical change of policy he seems to sacrifice efficiency for economy. I have an instance in my own city where the postmaster asked for an extra carrier for his force, as this is a growing, busy city, where many of the industries are engaged for the most part on war work. Unbeknown to the postmaster some inspectors were sent to that city to make an investigation, as a result of which six of the carriers in that office had their salaries reduced from \$1,200 to \$1,000 each. One of them was a veteran in the service of the United States, a Civil War veteran, who had been in the post office for a great many years. Without solicitation of the postmaster, without any warning, that man's salary was cut from \$1,200 to \$1,000, simply in order that there might be a saving in that office which might warrant putting on an extra carrier. No opportunity was given them, I understand, to pre-



sent their side of the case, as would be allowed if charges were preferred against them.

Mr. LARSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN. Do you know whether or not that individual's efficiency for service had increased or decreased?

Mr. WALSH. I know that the inspectors reported that that individual's record for efficiency was not up to the standard, but I know he claims he was doing the same work he had been doing for a long period, and I am informed that the postmaster had made no complaint nor had any falling off in the efficiency of that carrier been brought to his attention or of any of the six men whose salaries were reduced.

Mr. LOBECK. That is what the inspectors are for, is it not; to examine the force and demote efficient men?

Mr. WALSH. It is not the intention of the legislation under which we authorize inspectors that they should go snooping around at these various offices without notifying the postmasters that they are coming, or that they are there, or the purpose of their visit, unless a charge has been made concerning the efficiency or honesty of some employee. They are not attached to the Secret Service, nor are they enforcing the espionage law.

Mr. LOBECK. They do it anyway.

Mr. WALSH. They do it under this administration all over the country.

Mr. GORDON. I should like to ask the gentleman what he understands to be the duty of an inspector? Has he got to go around with a brass band?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no; he does not have to go around with a brass band.

Mr. GORDON. Well, what are his duties?

Mr. WALSH. I think an inspector is sent out to inspect, usually upon request filed by the postmaster, and it is only fair that the postmaster should know when the inspectors expect to arrive, and that he should be consulted, and that he should be asked as to whether a man is performing his duty in an efficient manner.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman wholly misunderstands the duties of inspectors. Inspectors are not under the orders of the postmaster.

Mr. WALSH. I do not contend that they should be.

Mr. GORDON. Why should the postmaster be notified, then?

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the gentleman that the postmaster is supposed to have some knowledge as to the manner in which the employees under his supervision are doing their work.

Mr. GORDON. Sometimes he has and sometimes he has not.

Mr. WALSH. I will say that in this instance he had, and that he protested against this reduction. It is not fair that the department should follow a policy that immediately puts a cloud on the postmaster and his office if he seeks to add to his force.

In this instance the worthy hawkshaws not only recommended demotion of these six men but also recommended abolishing a branch post office, which had been established a few years ago in the same city. That recommendation was followed only to the extent of issuing an order abolishing the branch office and then rescinding the order.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this would be a most opportune time to enact legislation looking to retirement of the superannuated employees of the Post Office Department, and it ought to be put on this law. Such a provision is of more vital importance than Government ownership of telephones here in the District, and it would save thousands of dollars to the department. The present head of the Post Office Department seeks to rule with a rod of iron, and his attitude toward his force is not such as to merit approval.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to speak on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations in connection with this bill granting increased compensation to employees in the Postal Service. The difficulty with this legislation is that we fail to approach the subject of compensation for Government employees in a thoroughgoing or logical manner. This is piecemeal legislation. The complaint of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], who spoke a few minutes ago, is to a great extent well founded. It looks at first glance as if we are trying to legislate permanently for a situation which is temporary in its character. The mistake he makes, however, is this: The permanent feature of this bill is an attempt to provide an adequate compensation. Inflated prices have reduced the purchasing value of the dollar. There has been an actual diminution of the salary of the Government employee. This bill seeks to overcome the discrepancy.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. This legislation was not originated on account of the war. It was originated long before the war, and should have been enacted before the war, and is entitled to be enacted on its merits, regardless of the war. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON. I understand that. Will the bill accomplish the proclaimed object? I doubt it. We should, without delay, undertake legislation to secure to the men and women who work for the Government at least a minimum wage. The minimum should enable the worker to provide for himself and his family food, clothing, shelter, an opportunity for education and for recreation, to rebuild one's body. That is the minimum, and whether a man is skilled or unskilled, whether he is a bricklayer or an astronomer, he is entitled to that minimum compensation, particularly if he is in the employ of the Government.

When we take old men who are utterly incompetent, a man who has been 50 years or 40 years in the service, who has in his younger days contributed to the welfare and prosperity of the country by rendering loyal service in the particular field in which he was engaged; when we take an old veteran who has offered his life to save the Republic and we retain him in the employ of the Government solely because of his past services, we do an injustice. We do not promote efficiency. The proper way to handle that situation would be to adopt proper retirement legislation, an old-age pension system, so that the old man who has spent his entire life in the service of the community should not be thrown upon the scrap heap when he is physically incapable of continuing his work.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What would you do with the old men in private employment who have reached the same stage of inefficiency?

Mr. LONDON. In the few minutes I have, I have set out to deal with the subject of Government employees. The Government can not afford to be a mean employer. In the relation between the Government and its employees there should be a higher standard than the standard which Carlyle designated as the standard of the dollar mark. These relations must be humanized. I know what I would do with the private employee who has been rendering useful service to the world and who has been helping to build up industries and the prosperity of the country. I would take care of him in his old age. I would not throw him into the junk heap. That was the object of the insurance resolution which I introduced and which many of you gentlemen, who did not understand, voted against, and which some of you who did understand voted against, because it was for the benefit of the people.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. Would it not be an excellent example to furnish to the private employer if the Government itself would do it?

Mr. LONDON. Of course, the Government should be the first to teach us humanity in economic relations and not rely upon the old worn-out theory of the so-called law of supply and demand and survival of the fittest, which in industry very often means the survival of the vilest scoundrels and the most shameless and conscienceless employers.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is true that some of the railroads of the country have taken their old employees and have placed them on the pension list.

Mr. LONDON. The difficulty with private pensions is just this: When a private corporation puts a man on the pension list, it acts upon the theory that the employee during his hours of vigor shall do everything the employer asks him to do, so that the old-age pension is held up by the private employer as a bribe, as an inducement to the employee that he should be obedient, submissive, and docile during that period of his life when he could by fighting obtain better conditions, or private pension for old age is held out as a reward for being a slave during the active age of life.

Mr. BLACK. Do I understand the gentleman to take the position of opposing the methods that some corporations have resorted to in the pensioning of employees?

Mr. LONDON. I say that the methods of employment of private corporations—

Mr. BLACK. Is the gentleman opposed to it?

Mr. LONDON. I am in favor of compulsory old-age pensions for private employees. I do not believe in charity—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes further.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. A minimum wage bill and a thoroughgoing old-age pension system would go a great way to improve the situation.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Will he yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to ask the gentleman how he accounts for the fact that in the presence of old-age pensions in England, France, Germany, Australia, New Zealand, and even Turkey, this great munificent Nation has overlooked it?

Mr. LONDON. Because we have too many stand-pat Republicans and too many Bourbon Democrats. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the pending measure will pass the House by an overwhelming vote. I am heartily in favor of the bill, especially as amended, making the compensatory provisions permanent. The increases in compensation are extremely moderate, and no substantial reason can be given why these faithful employees of the Government should be compelled to make another long and protracted fight for well-merited recognition after the termination of the war. Now that the opportunity is at hand to give them justice, we should give them full justice. Only in this way, in my judgment, can we show that heretofore we meant what we said when we told them that we would do all within our power to obtain for them the fair and equitable allowances to which they are reasonably and most deservedly entitled. [Applause.]

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of making a raid on the Treasury such as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] have so vividly described, but I am very much in favor of the Government doing justice to its servants and paying a living wage to its employees in the Postal Service. At this very hour we are facing a crisis that beggars description and surpasses comprehension. In order to meet it the Government is calling upon its citizens of every rank and station to make such sacrifices of money, time, and men as have never before been called for in the history of any land. The people are promptly and freely responding to the call. They are donating their time to the Government; they are lending their money to the Government; they are giving their flesh and blood to the Government to be consumed upon the altar of war. At such a time and in such circumstances, when the Government is admonishing all to be generous, it can not afford to be less than just to those who perform its most important functions and bear its heaviest loads.

This is a time when patriotism should be promoted, not suppressed. While no one provided for in the pending bill would measure his patriotism or allegiance to his country by any increase in compensation that might be granted or withheld, it is, nevertheless, a fact that the employees in the Postal Service can not continue to live on the rate of wages they are now receiving. When the laboring class, to which these most deserving employees belong, shall cease to live then allegiance and patriotism will necessarily die.

Some of those for whom we are providing in the measure before the House have received no increase in compensation since 1907; the remainder have had no advance since 1912. It is therefore apparent that the present rate of pay for postal employees was fixed under economic conditions that have long since been swept away. Since 1912 the cost of living has increased about 63 per cent; since 1907 it has increased considerably more than 63 per cent. Therefore the increase in wages provided by this bill, though large it may seem to those who oppose the measure, will scarcely offset the last five years' increase in the cost of living. To my mind, simple justice demands that the proposed relief should be speedily granted and that these worthy employees be thus enabled to live up to the present standard of life set by an entirely new order of things.

As there is absolutely no evidence before us that normal conditions, as we knew them before the war, will ever again prevail, it is my sincere hope that the House will agree to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], adopted by the committee on last Friday, making all the increases carried in the bill permanent, instead of temporary. If the present high cost of living, largely brought about by the war, should be substantially reduced upon the restoration of peace, and it should then be found that the increases allowed are excessive, Congress will still have the power of repeal and the authority to make such adjustments as good judgment may

suggest and justice may require. Let us not anticipate the future by fixing a date upon which this beneficent legislation shall automatically expire. Let us rather leave to a future Congress the task of dealing with a future problem. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REAVIS. Assuming the prewar condition will recur after this war is over and prices that obtained before the war should return, does the gentleman believe that \$100 a month to a Government employee who gives all of his service and all of his time to the work of his employment is too much, even under normal conditions?

Mr. NEELY. I do not think it is enough.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe these employees are entitled to receive a reasonable compensation for the services rendered. These men are giving the very best part of their lives to our Government and are only receiving a small wage. It has been a number of years since the employees of the Postal Department have received an increase of pay. The cost of living during this time has been constantly increasing. We must take into consideration the fact that these employees must support their families and educate their children on the compensation received from the Government, and I submit that the present high cost of living will quickly absorb this compensation.

The rural carrier is confronted with a double expenditure. He must not only provide for his family at the present high cost, but he must pay for his own equipment and the upkeep of the same at the greatly increased cost.

The Postal Department requires a high standard of efficiency in all its branches. The people of the country want and require efficient service in this department. I believe all these employees should receive reasonable and fair pay for the faithful and efficient services they are rendering the people.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the most noisy and boisterous speeches I have heard here for a long time have been made by those people who are denouncing this bill as a raid upon the Treasury; that we are doing something that is unfair and unwarranted. Now, I am going to support this bill, not because of the war or anything in connection with the war. I heard men say it is a shame to spend the Government's money at this time to increase salaries when men are going to the trenches at \$30 a month. Why, are not the sons of those men who are working for the Government going into the trenches like the sons of anybody else? The Government employee is a man who is working for a salary, and a very stingy salary in most cases, and any man who wants to live respectably at such wages can not raise a family and do it in a respectable way, because we are not giving them suitable pay, a respectable wage.

Now, these men who work for the Government, many of them, are losing their sons who are going into the Army at a time when they are needed at home, because many who are working for the Government have little homes they are compelled to pay for to save them. Now, there is no consideration given to those people whatever, and thousands have left the Government service for the Army and we want to provide a decent wage for them when they come back. Why, some men say here, "We are in favor of the rural carrier getting more wages; we are in favor of all the employees of the postal department getting more wages but—," and they stop at that because of some reason. If there is any class of employees in the Government service that Congress is afraid of it is the rural carrier, and I do not except the farmer, and God knows they have been well taken care of. There is no employee in the service of the Government that a Congressman will jump quicker for or they are more anxious to help than a rural carrier, and you can not deny it. With what unanimity we proceeded to increase the salary of the rural carrier. Boost it up everybody. What about the country merchant? There are a good many people doing business in the rural districts, little country merchants as well as general stores, and if there is one thing more than another that has helped put the little country merchant out of business it is the rural carrier. They have made many millionaires in our cities because of the rural free delivery, and great mail-order houses have grown up in every section of the country as a result of the rural carrier service, putting the small country merchant and the general store out of business. Let the country merchant read the proceedings here and find out how anxious this Congress is to increase the salary of the rural carrier.

The rural carrier has a chance to provide for his family on the side by raising produce in his little garden. He can also secure cheaper rent. But the city carrier or clerk has no such opportunity. The city carrier has nothing but expense from morning until night. The rural carrier has many advantages



that are not to be had in the city, and here we find Members protesting about giving city postal employees a respectable wage. I know something about living conditions in the city. The poor in the big cities, and in medium-sized cities, are much worse off than the poor in the rural districts. They can not live as well at the same salary, and if they are raising a family they are ground down to the bare necessities of life.

Now, I am in favor of a respectable wage for all these people. I am not afraid of any of the powers that be. I have no post office in my district nor any postmasters to appoint, so I am free to say what I please about this situation. If there is any class of people that are entitled to a respectable wage from the Government it is the postal employees, and I make no exceptions. And I am not in favor of it because these are abnormal times. I am in favor of it because they are entitled to it. I think we are simply proceeding to give them what they earn—a respectable wage—and I want it to continue not because we are at war but after the war, because they are entitled to it and are deserving of it.

I hear so many Members here telling about the condition of the Treasury. They are frightened. Why, I heard somebody say here the other day when we talked about increasing the wages of Government clerks that the farmers did not have anybody in the gallery to show their appreciation of what was being done for the farmer. But they do not need anybody here. The farmers' interests are well looked after right on the floor of this House, and have been for some time, while those working for the Government in cities are compelled to have representatives here to obtain the recognition that they deserve.

Some idea of the conditions surrounding postal employees in the city can be gleaned from the testimony of Mrs. Frank Halas, president of the Woman's Auxiliary of the National Federation of Postal Employees, before the House Post Office Committee December 17 last. She said:

I have had Congressmen tell me that if postal clerks did not like the conditions under which they are working at the post office, let them go back to the farm. That is not an answer. You can not pack your things in a suit case and go back to the farm just because you do not like the conditions under which you are working. It takes money to pack your things and go back to the farm. Suppose some one came to the postal employees in Chicago with money and said to them, "You can all pack your suit cases and go back to the farm; here is the money to do it with"; what would be the result? Every one of those postal clerks would be arrested for conspiracy to delay the mails.

Now, is it fair, when you are trying to live, when you are nearly starving, when you can not buy the necessities for your family, when you have to see your children go to school not clothed as warmly as they might be, when they have to go without the pleasures and sometimes without the necessities that other children are enjoying—is it right—is it fair and square for a Congressman to come and say to you, "If you do not like it you can go back to the farm," knowing perfectly well all the time that if all the post-office clerks in Chicago did go back to the farm to-morrow they would land in jail for conspiracy to delay the mails?

And if they did go back to the farm, who would step in to take their places? Now, is that fair? I can not answer that question in the affirmative; I can not say it is fair.

I had a peculiar situation come up a while ago. A woman called me up and asked me to go to her house; she wanted me to hear her story, but she did not have presentable clothes to come out in. Her husband is getting \$900 a year in the Chicago post office, and they have three children. Three days before each pay day—one is on the 3d and one on the 18th—that husband and wife have black coffee, without cream or sugar, and unbuttered brown bread; that is what they are living on; and I am going to ask you, as true a citizen as I am, do you think that a man can get up and cheer as lustily, living on black coffee and unbuttered brown bread, as you and I can, with three square meals a day? He can not do it. I am patriotic; but I say you are asking the impossible when you ask that.

And I say the women are smarting under the unfairness of it. Their husbands are working nights, many of them, and those women are going out and hunting up jobs for their men, going out looking for chances for their men to get out of the service. There is a shortage of help now in the Chicago post office. I have a statement here [indicating] in a newspaper quoting Mr. Galbraith, superintendent of mails in Chicago. He says:

"We have men now in all of the Chicago regiments and in camp at many different cantonments. Then we have had an unusual number of resignations of capable mail workers who have taken at higher salaries places of men who have left mercantile life in Chicago to join either the Navy, Army, or Aviation Corps."

He says there is a shortage now. He is sending out appeals for people to come in.

I was recently asked to sit on a subcommittee on women and children in Chicago, of which Mr. Boyd, who is the head of the State employment department in Chicago, was chairman. All the men in that work in Chicago know that I am the head of the women's work. They see me aged-looking and careworn at the stories I have had to hear in the last two or three years; and when the women see me on these different committees, like Mrs. Raymond Robins's, they always think of the postal clerks; they know that when I am quiet I am thinking of the postal clerks. That day I was not saying much, and Mr. Boyd was talking about the labor situation; and Mrs. Robins said to me, "What is the matter there at the post office?" Mr. Boyd said, "We are sending them men every day; there is not a shortage of men in Chicago." That was in October. He said, "We are sending them men every day. But they can not keep their men; those men are put in as substitutes at 35 cents an hour; as soon as they have been there long enough they are put on regularly at 27

cents an hour. They are given a big scheme to study after their working hours. If it is a day shift, they work 11 hours, and the night shift works 13 hours.

Our families have to double up; two families are going into one small house; and you have again an exemplification of the old story that there is no house big enough to hold two families. There are houses in Chicago now that hold three families, so that the postal clerks can live. Some of our women are working, although they have little children to take care of, so that their husbands can have a few hours off at night.

And am I saying anything wrong; am I exaggerating in any way when I say that our women are smarting under the unfairness and the injustice of the thing? I am sure that it is all because you gentlemen do not understand. A very good friend of the postal employees said last year when I told him that our standards of living are being broken down—he said, "Don't tell me that; don't I know it." Everyone else has had his salary increased. How about our salaries, that have not been increased for 10 years? How about us? We are simply on the verge of desperation, and the men are leaving the post office; and if something is not done for them they will keep on leaving the post office every time they find an opportunity on the outside.

These are conditions that I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, and I believe you will agree with me that they ought to be remedied. The Postal Department is not run for gain or profit, and with the increased postage of 3 cents on first-class letters it will more than pay double the amount of the increase of salaries provided for in this bill. What we should do, and ought to do, if we wish to do the right thing, would be to provide a suitable retirement law that would provide for old-age pensions that would insure Government employees against want in their old age after spending all of the best years of their lives in faithful and honorable service for the Government.

I hope this bill will pass with a good big majority in its favor.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to insist that debate shall be confined to the amendment after this.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Did I not talk on the amendment?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, I would like the five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee—

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. I wanted to inquire if the motion made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] was put and carried.

The CHAIRMAN. It was a mistake of the Chair. The Chair was stating a unanimous-consent request. It was a motion. The vote is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] to close general debate in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] about 20 minutes ago made a motion to close debate in 10 minutes, and that was carried.

The CHAIRMAN. That was on another amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There was no vote on the other amendment.

Mr. MOON. That was on the Cox amendment, which was voted on and lost. This is on the Madden amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration, entitled "Granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes," is a great step in the right direction.

I am heartily in favor of the bill and for a long time have used every effort in having the same brought to the attention of Congress and justice done to these Government employees.

I do not think that the bill is fair, however, in that it limits the increased pay for the period of the war and for 90 days after the proclamation of peace. And for that reason I am in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], which so changes the bill as to make its provisions and increases permanent legislation.

There is certainly no class of employees in the Government service who have the greater confidence of the American people than do the postal employees. They enter into closer association with our social, political, and business operations than any other class of men.

Representing as I do a district wholly within the city of Baltimore, I come in direct communication with that class of employees known as carriers and postal clerks. They are as fine a body of men as one can meet in his general social and business operations. They are always courteous and agreeable, ready and willing to do everything in their power for the benefit of the service and the convenience of the public. From them must spring in future the men and women who are to comprise a large part of the body politic of our land.

The postal clerks have not had an increase of salary for more than 10 years, and have long been protesting to the Government against the injustice done them. The letter carriers have had some increases, but they have not been in proportion to the cost of living and other expenses which they are compelled to sustain. The cost of living has increased during the last few years some 43 per cent, while the increases provided in this bill amount to only 15 or 20 per cent.

If we would have our postal employees continue the high standard which they have always maintained we must provide them with sufficient salary upon which to live and to educate and provide for their offspring and care for them in the proper manner.

The increases as provided in the bill are as follows:

Clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade.

That hereafter the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1 at \$1,100; grade 2 at \$1,200; grade 3 at \$1,300; grade 4 at \$1,400; grade 5 at \$1,500; grade 6 at \$1,600; grade 7 at \$1,700; grade 8 at \$1,800; grade 9 at \$1,900; grade 10 at \$2,000.

You will note from this that these salaries are not much larger than the ordinary laborer can obtain in these war times. More than 200,000 employees are affected by this bill, and they are efficient and loyal, as everyone here can certify. Upon them rests the responsibility of performing a very important part of our public service, and they are entitled to receive such compensation as will attract and hold competent men.

I realize that this bill will entail an outlay of about \$30,000,000, but we must also take into consideration that this money is not taken from the pockets of the taxpayer, but is provided out of the revenue of the Postal Department. The Postal Department has for some years past had a surplus, and with the increased cost of the mail the amount provided herein will be far exceeded by the increased revenue, so that it will not be a charge upon the individual, but a charge upon the funds of the Postal Department, which is self-sustaining.

For many years this Government provided mailing facilities for second-class matter at a loss of \$80,000,000 to our country. But this has been largely corrected by legislation recently enacted, so that we are now enabled to do justice to the employees instead of making this huge gift to publishers.

In creating this increase we must not only take into consideration the increased cost of living, but we must also take into consideration the fact that since the creation of the Parcel Post System a very large amount of additional work has been cast upon these employees. I have seen, and no doubt you have all seen, these men laden to their full strength with parcel-post matter, which they deliver in their respective sections of the city and country. The work has become onerous and exacting, but the efficiency of the men has been maintained and they have shown by their constancy that they are willing to do the utmost amount of work within their power and strength. While all this additional work has been cast upon them, I have yet to find one man complaining of his task. But each and every one has gone about it with continued energy, exactness, and willingness.

I realize that we should not increase salaries any more than it is necessary to do; but we must take into consideration the fact that the income of the vast majority of these men depends solely upon the work they perform and that they have no other revenue nor opportunity to earn money except that which comes through the salaries provided. Their labor is their sole capital and the only thing they have to sell.

These men have never threatened strike. They have never threatened a walkout. Their unions have never exerted undue influence upon the National Government. They have always been ready to lay their case before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and to leave it with that committee to decide what is fair and just compensation for the work performed. That committee, after a long and exhaustive hearing, taking into consideration every angle of the case, hearing men on all sides, have concluded that the salaries provided in this bill should be granted. I am therefore strongly in favor of the

prompt passage of this bill so that these men may obtain what they should have had long ago.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MOON. What is the gentleman proposing to discuss here? He is not talking to this amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am talking about the bill in general.

Mr. MOON. That is general debate, but go ahead. I do not object.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I realize, as do we all, that the demands upon the National Government are extremely heavy during this critical period of the world war. I realize that the taxpayers of the country are contributing to the National Treasury the sums demanded of them without a murmur of complaint, but with a willingness and desire to do all that they can in the support of the National Government in this time of need and in the prosecution of this tremendous war. I realize that in the years to come the burden must rest more heavily upon the people of the country than perhaps ever in its history. Yet we must also take into consideration that it is the duty of the National Government to be just and fair with its employees, as private enterprise has been with those under its employment. As I look about me I behold that every industry of commerce and business, every manufacturing concern, even private employers and all persons needing the help of others, have increased the salaries of their men. They do it not from a desire to be generous or to dispose of their funds, but they realize that if they would have their men live and be able to perform the work devolving upon them they must have proper salaries to maintain themselves and their families and to equip their children for the work of future generations.

The National Government has not been liberal in salaries. It has obtained splendid men without very large compensation, but it has always been the desire of the Government to be fair and just, and for that reason the bill reported from the committee will become a law and will redound to the great benefit of the postal employees and naturally to the Postal Service.

No man can perform with efficiency the work before him unless he is able to be properly cared for and to care for those dependent upon him. This bill, I believe, will accomplish that end.

The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois making it permanent legislation is to my mind quite essential to this bill. It has been the history of our country that when prices advance they seldom react to their original level. In some instances or for some articles the prices may go down, but as a general rule they are maintained permanently.

I do not think that there is any Member of this House before me to-day who will contend that there is any possibility of prices reacting to such an extent that the salaries called for by this bill will not be required. It is, therefore, essential that we pass the bill with the amendment, so that the employees will know that their salaries are fixed permanently and that there will be no need of further hearings and agitation in order to maintain them at the standard established in this bill.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that the bill with this amendment will pass and become one of the laws of the country at an early date.

I can speak in behalf of those men of my city engaged in the postal work that they will not only appreciate the justness and fairness of the legislation but that they will be, if it is possible, more energetic and more earnest in the performance of their duties than ever before. As I have said, they are a splendid body of men, always energetic, always willing, and always perform their duty in the most efficient and proper manner. They have the confidence and esteem of every class of our citizens.

The old and the young of our great metropolis wish them well. They perform their work with quietude and exactness, are always on their job, whether it be in the heat of the summer's noonday sun or among the winter's blasts. I am glad to see justice done them at last. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The vote is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BLACK. This is an amendment as a substitute to the section. If any gentleman has anything to perfect the section, it should be offered now.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.



Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I wanted to offer there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McClintic] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McClintic: Add to section 1 the following: "Provided, That those who were performing service as motor carriers shall receive a 10 per cent increase of salary on the amount they are now receiving."

Mr. McClintic. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have that amendment reported again, so that I can understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be reported again.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. McClintic. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed by a member of the committee that the present bill under consideration does not contain any provision for the increase of the salary of those who are at this time performing service as motor carriers. I do not believe it is the intention of this House to make an unjust discrimination against any class of Government employees. I am specially pleased that the rural carriers have been granted a substantial increase. I know that the cost of living has increased in leaps and bounds, and when it is taken into consideration that the rural carrier must pay out for upkeep practically half of the amount he receives for performing this service, it can be readily seen that the increase of salary provided for in this bill is just and right.

I am sure that no Member of Congress who is posted as to the amount of expense necessary to keep up automobiles but will say that the motor carriers labor under as hard, if not harder, conditions as those who perform service as rural carriers. If you please, Mr. Chairman, the motor carrier must first take the examination under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission and make an eligible grade before he can receive an appointment. He must to a certain extent be a little better qualified than some of the wagon carriers, because he must know how to operate an automobile or a Ford before he can successfully perform the duties that devolve upon him.

In many sections of the United States they have macadam roads, and those who are performing service as motor carriers have a much easier time than those in the Middle West and the extreme West, where the roads are not so good. However, it can be said that in certain sections of the East where they have macadam roads the motor carriers often have to turn aside and follow the meanderings of some byway, and consequently their duties are often very hard when weather conditions are bad. Out in the central part of the United States and the Middle West, where we have no roads to speak of except those given us by nature, when wet weather comes, and especially in the wintertime, the trials and hardships of the motor carrier are very difficult, and it makes it nearly impossible for him to perform his duty in the proper manner.

Mr. Chairman, in the last week I have received three communications stating:

We would like to give up our contract with the Government. We would like to have these two routes that were formerly consolidated for the purpose of establishing a motor route discontinued, and, instead, wagon routes be reestablished. We would like to be given employment as carriers on wagon routes instead of motor routes.

A few minutes ago I opened my mail and I noticed an appeal that came from a motor carrier living in western Oklahoma. He says:

Mr. McClintic.

DEAR FRIEND: I have resigned as motor carrier on route A, as I believe I could not carry it without buying a new car. I have had three on it already, and for this reason I have decided to quit.

Mr. MOON. What is the length of the route?

Mr. McClintic. About 50 miles, I think.

Mr. MOON. Do you know what the man was getting?

Mr. McClintic. I think he was getting something between \$1,600 and \$1,800. I could not make an authentic statement as to that.

Mr. MOON. Do you know how long it took to perform the service?

Mr. McClintic. I can not give an accurate answer to your question; but, Mr. Chairman, I do know when the wet weather comes the motor carrier has to hire and pay out of his own pocket a man to go in a wagon or buggy and cover one-half of the route while he covers the other half.

Mr. MOON. That sort of a route ought to be abolished, ought it not?

Mr. McClintic. There is not a person living in that section of the country who can cover the motor route in wet weather with a team in a day. Consequently when bad weather comes the motor carrier has to suffer a great deal more than the wagon carrier. I do not believe that Congress should make a discrimination against this class of service. I think if there is any one class of Government employees that is entitled to some consideration it is that class which is to-day performing this kind of service at a financial loss. From the information I have received, practically every motor carrier in the district I have the honor to represent would gladly welcome the opportunity of accepting service on a wagon route on a basis of \$1,200 for a standard route and give up his position as motor carrier. This being the case, I think the United States Congress should be a little more merciful and not make a discrimination against those who are at this time rendering such splendid service while serving in this capacity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McClintic. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment may be adopted.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives has now been considering for some days a bill which, it seems, ought to have been speedily acted upon. The proposition is to increase the salaries of postal employees from 15 to 20 per cent. The cost of living during recent years has increased from 43 to 50 per cent. Why should there be any controversy about such a bill? Who is there that can dispute the justice of the contention of the proponents of this measure?

At this very moment, when the fate of civilization is hanging in the balance, men are criticizing the Government because, as they say, it does not synchronize the great industrial agencies of this Government and throw them in the balance of this war. There are at this very minute measures of most supreme importance absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of this war that are held up by this prolonged, and, as I submit, unnecessary, debate in the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

If you are going to pass your housing bill, which is necessary, as we are told by men upon both sides who know—necessary in the building of ships, when the cry is, "Ships, and ships, and more ships"—if we are going to take up that measure, and other measures equally vital, for God's sake let us put this one aside and bring these war bills to a vote. And there are still other measures that are pending before the committees of the House that are absolutely and vitally necessary for the prosecution of this war for which the departments of the Government are anxiously waiting before they have authority to act. And all the while the criticism goes on. Why isn't this done? Why will not officials speed up, speed up? And here we are consuming days in discussing a measure which should have come to a vote after two hours' debate. I rise here to make a plea that we come to a vote on this measure. Every man in this Chamber knows right now how he is going to vote. Further debate will accomplish nothing. Let us dispose of this bill and then take up these other measures that are supremely necessary to enable this Nation to do its part in saving civilization itself from destruction. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] press his point of order?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I care to make the point of order. I believe I will agree to this amendment for 10 per cent. It will cost the Government less money that way than it would under the bill as heretofore amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 46, noes 14.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members present, a quorum. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RUCKER (substitute for the paragraph on page 1, beginning at line 7): That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive a salary not exceeding \$2,200 per annum, the maximum salary to be based on the length of routes, the time required to serve them, and the number of pieces and weight of mail transported: *Provided*, That the minimum compensation of such carriers, payable monthly, shall be as follows: On routes of 24 miles, six times a week, \$1,350 per annum, and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, \$1,152; on routes 20 miles and less than 22 miles, \$1,080; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, \$960; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, \$840; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, \$720; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, \$672; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, \$624; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, \$576; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, \$528; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, \$480. A rural carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes: *Provided further*, That rural routes on which the use of a motor vehicle would be required shall be established only when a motor vehicle can be operated thereon with reasonable regularity for 10 months in the year: *And provided further*, That when any route is authorized that absorbs or eliminates existing routes the carriers affected thereby shall be retained in the order of their relative efficiency.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the committee, I will say that no friend of this amendment need fear the point of order, because I do not think, with all deference to the distinguished chairman of the committee, that it is subject to a point of order.

I want to address myself particularly to those members of the committee who are friends of rural carriers, and, addressing them, I want to say that there is not a more loyal friend of the men engaged in the Rural Free Delivery Service of mail than myself. I am their pronounced and unwavering friend. My vote on this question, or on anything that pertains to this bill, or on any question pertaining to any other bill is not the result of any menace of the rural carriers in my district nor is it because of any favor that I hope to receive at their hands. Many of them are Republicans and vote wrong anyway. I do not care the snap of my finger how any of them vote. It is a mere question of what is right in the premises. They are serving our constituents, and it so happens that we are charged with the responsibility and intrusted with the power of fixing their compensation, and it is our duty to be just and fair in our treatment of them.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. MOON. Can the gentleman inform the House what would be the difference in cost between the amount to be paid under his amendment and the 10 per cent proposition which has been adopted?

Mr. RUCKER. I am going to get to that in just a moment, if the gentleman will pardon me. Let me say that the first part of the substitute which I have offered reads as follows:

That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive a salary not exceeding \$2,200 per annum, the maximum salary to be based on the length of routes, the time required to serve them, and the number of pieces and weight of mail transported.

That provision gives latitude or flexibility and permits the Post Office Department, if it sees fit to do so in meritorious cases, to allow compensation to the rural carriers above the minimum amount which the substitute that I offer authorizes.

This substitute provides a minimum salary of exactly the same sum that is carried in the bill reported by the committee, \$1,200, with 15 per cent added to it, or \$1,380 per annum. It not only does that, but it goes down the line in the same ratio as to the salaries for carriers on shorter routes than 24 miles. It provides the same pay for routes in excess of 24 miles that the pending bill provides.

The pending bill is unjust in this: It provides a flat rate of pay. Where the carrier now gets \$1,200 under the bill as amended, he would get 20 per cent added. Under this amendment that I offer the minimum amount that the carrier would receive is the amount written in the bill as reported by the committee, namely, \$1,380. Thus the pending substitute would enable the Post Office Department under the first clause of this amendment to regulate and adjust salaries above the minimum, taking into consideration the number of miles traveled, the number of pieces of mail handled, and the weight of the mail. For instance, out of a given town two routes are established, one 24 miles long and the other 22 miles long. The man who travels over 22 miles delivers, I will assume, 3,000 pieces of mail a month, while the man who travels 24 miles delivers only 2,500 pieces of mail a month. So the man traveling the shorter distance performs the greatest service, based on the number of pieces of mail delivered. This substitute would permit the department to deal fairly with the carrier on the short route and pay him for service actually performed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask how much more time there is for debate on this section?

The CHAIRMAN. There is just five minutes remaining.

Mr. MOON. Some other gentlemen may want to offer an amendment.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I want to offer.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's time may be extended for five minutes, regardless of the agreement.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no; I object.

Mr. RUCKER. I would like time to answer the chairman's question.

Mr. MOON. I will state that I do not control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes, unless some one else wants the time.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee just fixed the time a moment ago in which to close debate. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. Does the gentleman from Tennessee press his point of order?

Mr. MOON. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RUCKER. I will be glad to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this is not germane because the amendment that is proposed here seeks to enact legislation as to what shall be the basis of pay. At the present time the Postmaster General has full authority to determine the conditions under which the scale of pay shall be based, within the various grades, with a maximum of \$1,200 and \$24 per mile for extra mile. That is the existing law. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] attempts to change that law, which the Chairman will find, I believe, in the Post Office appropriation act for the fiscal year 1916, in some radical particulars. This bill does not seek to change the basis of compensation, except the maximum that may be received, and does not seek to interfere with the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is needlessly disturbing himself about interfering with the discretion of the Postmaster General. The very amendment I offered was written in the Post Office Department this morning.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not affect the position which I take, that it is a change of law.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph for which I offer this amendment as a substitute has reference to fixing the compensation of rural delivery carriers. This substitute does that. It does no more than that, and the only reason the point of order is made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, in my judgment, is because he knows that it is a good amendment and fears that it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the amendment offered by Mr. TAGUE and amended by Mr. BLACK and insert:

Line 13, page 2, after "\$2,000," add the following:

"The Postmaster General shall classify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks under such regulations as he may prescribe in the grades provided by law and for the purpose of organization and of establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively, as hereinafter provided; he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows:

"Class A, \$1,100 to \$1,400; class B, \$1,400 to \$1,500; and class C, \$1,500 to \$1,700. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such postal railway clerks as may be necessary, and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices: *Provided*, That upon the passage of this act railway postal clerks shall pass automatically from the grades they are in and the salaries they receive under the act of August 24, 1912, to the corresponding grade, with salaries provided for in this act."



Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if there is any objection to this amendment, which is clearly in order, I am ready to withdraw it. My amendment merely clarifies the situation that was brought about on Saturday, when I offered an amendment, which was afterwards amended by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], as to just how the amendment offered by me would operate.

Mr. FOSTER. I would inquire of the gentleman if it simply clarifies that and makes it subject to the law?

Mr. TAGUE. That is all. It makes it in accordance with the permanent law, except in so far as it changes the figures \$200.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understood the original amendment offered by the gentleman and adopted on Friday, it would have compelled the department to promote every railway mail clerk regardless of the work or grade in which he is performing that work until they receive the maximum salary of \$2,000. That was the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TAGUE. That clearly was not the intent of the amendment, although the gentleman raised that point.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is clear on its face it would have that effect. Then the gentleman from Texas offered an amendment attempting to restrict it, and now the gentleman is seeking to clarify the situation by this substitute amendment.

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, may I inquire what is the maximum salary a railway postal clerk will receive under the amendment now offered?

Mr. TAGUE. What grade?

Mr. STAFFORD. C.

Mr. TAGUE. Not above \$2,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. One gentleman says \$2,000 and another says \$1,700, what does the gentleman say?

Mr. TAGUE. Seventeen hundred dollars. I want to say, too, Mr. Chairman, after all has been said about the amount of increase the men in the Post Office Department are going to get under this bill that the employees of railway post-office section under this amendment will receive a raise of 16 per cent over that which they are getting at the present time. There has also been a great deal said about the raid on the Treasury and how we are swooping down to get all of this great amount of money out of the pockets of the people.

The Post Office Department is a self-sustaining body and there is no money taken out of the Treasury of the United States to pay any of these salaries. They have had a surplus every year in the Treasury of this department. I want, also, to call to the minds of the Members of this body who recall the debate on the report of the Committee on Ways and Means in the last session, that the fact was brought out then that we were presenting every year to the magazine men of this country and the newspapers of this country over \$80,000,000 that was paid out of the earnings of the Post Office Department. Yet when we are asking a raise of salary and wages of men who earn this money there is an objection made and a strong one, too. Now, another question brought out here has been that this is practically a war measure, and the boys are going to the front and fighting for \$30 and \$40 a month. Yes; Mr. Chairman, they are going to the front—God bless and protect them—and thousands of these same young men who have answered the call to do their duty were in the service of the United States in the Post Office Department and have already gone to the front, and we are trying to help them, too. Now, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is no question in the minds of the people of the country that the employees in this branch of the service are entitled to a raise in their salaries. They earn the money, and the increase will not be a drain on the Treasury of the United States.

You have been told that the increases in this bill will cost more than \$60,000,000, and figures already presented here show that this item of raise in railway post-office clerks' salaries will cost over \$5,000,000. I submit these figures are not correct and will insert in the Record figures showing that the amount for compensation to railway postal clerks by an increase of \$200 in each grade, based upon the number of clerks actually employed during the fiscal year of 1917, will total not more than \$3,759,000. In this one item alone it shows the discrepancy of almost a million and a half. I believe a fair criticism of the figures submitted by several of the Members who have preceded me are inclined to show a somewhat similar discrepancy, and that the increase resulting from the passage of this bill will not reach the amount claimed by its opponents.

Percentage increases in salaries of railway postal clerks if \$200 is granted in each grade.

	Per cent.
\$200 increase in \$900 grade equals.....	22 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,000 grade equals.....	20
\$200 increase in \$1,100 grade equals.....	18 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,200 grade equals.....	16 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,300 grade equals.....	15 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,400 grade equals.....	14 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,500 grade equals.....	13 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,600 grade equals.....	12 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,700 grade equals.....	11 2/3
\$200 increase in \$1,800 grade equals.....	11 1/3
\$200 increase in \$1,900 grade equals.....	10 2/3
\$200 increase in \$2,000 grade equals.....	10

One thousand five hundred dollars is the maximum salary of railway postal clerks; \$1,600, \$1,700, and \$1,800 are clerks in charge.

Average daily wage of railway postal clerks in the various grades and the number in each grade, 1917.

Grade.	Salary.	Number of clerks.	Average daily wage.
1.....	\$900	915	\$2.50
2.....	1,000	84	2.88
3.....	1,100	771	3.09
4.....	1,200	4,154	3.33
5.....	1,300	1,624	3.61
6.....	1,400	831	3.88
7.....	1,500	7,587	4.16
8.....	1,600	549	4.44
9.....	1,700	1,872	4.72
10.....	1,800	413	5.00

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not make the point of order; I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, regular order; it is too late.

Mr. LARSEN. This is the regular order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Does not the gentleman rise for recognition in connection with his amendment? And if he is recognized, he has the right to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recalls that he promised the gentleman to recognize him to offer an amendment, which had escaped the memory of the Chair.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "grade," insert "Provided, That the salary of no carrier in City Delivery Service shall be advanced to a grade or receive such compensation as will permit his salary to exceed the compensation allowed to the assistant postmaster in such office."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, one minute. Am I not entitled to recognition to discuss the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time was fixed by motion, and it has expired.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an opportunity to explain the provisions of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes to explain the provisions of the amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to object, but we must proceed with the consideration of this bill.

Mr. LARSEN. The gentleman will not make any time, I will promise.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all right.

Mr. LARSEN. I have a right to be heard—

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not make anything by making threats.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. LARSEN) there were—ayes 3, noes 22.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A hundred and fifteen gentlemen are present, a quorum, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices, departmental clerks and post-office clerks, laborers, watchmen, printers, chauffeurs, messengers, charwomen, janitors in post offices and per diem employees, and all other postal employees not enumerated in section 1 whose rate of compensation is \$1,200 or less per annum shall receive 15 per cent increase in their compensation, and those receiving salaries from \$1,200 to and including \$1,800 shall receive an increase of 10 per cent: *Provided*, That substitute letter carriers and substitute clerks shall receive as their compensation 40 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That hereafter watchmen, messengers, and laborers in first and second class post offices shall be required to work not more than eight hours a day, and that the eight hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours, and the schedules of duty of the watchmen, messengers, and laborers shall be regulated accordingly, and that in cases of emergency or if the needs of the service require, watchmen, messengers, and laborers in first and second class post offices may be required to work in excess of eight hours a day, and for such additional services they shall be paid extra in proportion to their salaries as fixed by law.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend section 2, page 2, line 15, by striking out the words "departmental clerks."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Amend section 2, page 2, line 15, by striking out the words "departmental clerks."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the reason for that amendment is this: The departmental service is a distinct service from the Postal Service. This bill, in its main features, pertains to the postal and not the departmental service. Some days ago the House passed a bill in which it provided for the salaries of all clerks in the departmental service of the Post Office and, of course, the House does not want now to undertake to—

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, that is provided for in the deficiency bill, is it not?

Mr. MOON. Yes; that is the bill of which I am speaking.

Mr. MADDEN. And ought not to be reenacted.

Mr. MOON. The House does not want to take up and review that matter, and the understanding was when this rule was granted, too, that the motion to strike out those words "departmental clerks" would be made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether the class "janitors in post offices," who are paid out of the sundry civil bill and receive \$120 general increase provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill that was passed recently, should not also be eliminated from this bill?

Mr. MOON. I think any departmental clerk or official ought to be stricken from this bill in view of the other bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am referring especially to the class in line 17, page 2, "janitors in post offices."

Mr. MOON. No; they are really under the Treasury Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I am directing the attention of the chairman to the fact that they are paid for out of the sundry civil appropriation bill, and, if so, they would be provided for in the general increase of \$120 that was carried by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. MOON. They ought to be stricken out too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as suggested to be amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the committee amendment by striking out on page 2, line 17, the words "janitors in post offices."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague a question. The reason I rose at this time was to ask this question: In the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, my colleague reminds us, there was an increase of \$120 for "janitors in post offices." Is that so?

Mr. STAFFORD. There was; and to all those who were in the governmental service except those paid from the postal revenues and from the Treasury to meet the deficits arising when the postal revenues were not adequate.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, then, a janitor receiving \$55 a month, which is \$660 a year, under that provision in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill would receive \$120 increase, which would be \$780.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is correct in his mathematics.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And then under this bill he would receive 15 per cent—

Mr. STAFFORD. On \$660. Of course, the inquiry that I made of the chairman was whether it was his purpose to give

these employees a double increase. He says that is not his purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That, Mr. Chairman, would only give them \$870 if they received both increases, which is not a large salary. Indeed, it is a very inadequate salary in these times for a man and his family to live on.

Mr. MOON. Of course, this committee and the committee that brought the bill to the House have the right to legislate on that subject. But, so far as the appropriation is concerned, why, fundamentally, they do not have the right to appropriate for departmental clerks, and janitors in that department would be under the Treasury Department. I made that motion to cover departmental clerks in order to have no conflict with the other bill.

Now, I agree with my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that these janitors are poorly paid, and ought to be well taken care of. But I thought it my duty to bring that before the House for whatever action they wanted to take.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. As I understood the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] it was to strike out "janitors in post offices."

Mr. STAFFORD. I offered no amendment. The gentleman from Tennessee offered it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Wisconsin called attention to it.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to change my motion again. Before we come to the question of "janitors in post offices," I ask leave to submit the other motion, and then we can take that up afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. LARSEN and Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] another amendment?

Mr. MOON. No. I have no other amendment.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. MOON. I move, Mr. Chairman, that when the amendments are offered all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me? Will not the gentleman include in that that all amendments may be offered now, and then they may be pending to be voted on when the time comes?

Mr. MOON. The gentleman can amend my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this section—

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, can I be heard in opposition to that?

The CHAIRMAN. When the Chair states it.

Mr. LARSEN. It is not a request for unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. It is on a motion.

Mr. LARSEN. I want to be heard in opposition to the motion.

Mr. MOON. It is not a debatable motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Just wait until the Chair states it.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] moves that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto shall close in 30 minutes. The motion is not debatable.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, Mr. CLARK of Florida, and Mr. DALLINGER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is recognized.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma moves to amend by inserting on page 2, line 18, after the word "employees," the words "including allowances for clerk hire at third-class post offices."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in reporting this bill the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads seems to have omitted from the increases the poorest paid employees in the Postal Service, to wit, the clerks at third-class post offices. The compensation of these clerks is not stationary and fixed as that of the usual Government employees. The third-class postmaster has an allowance of from \$300 to \$800 for clerk hire, \$300 being the limit of compensation at the lowest class office and \$800 at the highest office. The salaries of the third-class postmaster range from \$1,000 to \$1,900 per annum. This would



make a maximum allowance at the low-grade third-class office for pay of postmasters and clerk hire of not exceeding \$1,300, which we must admit is woefully insufficient for the subsistence of two families.

I have consulted with the First Assistant Postmaster General concerning this matter, and he agrees that these employees are about as poorly paid as any in the Postal Service and thinks that if this bill becomes a law these clerks at third-class post offices should be provided for. He has examined this amendment and says it covers the case completely.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FOSTER. Take a case like this: Suppose in third-class post offices there is allowed for clerical hire, say, \$600. Now, how would the gentleman's amendment affect that allowance?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The \$600 class?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It would increase his allowance by \$90, making it \$690.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be \$690?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSTER. Supposing you had two of them. Supposing you had \$800 and paid each clerk \$400?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Then each clerk would get \$60 extra.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose the postmaster pays out of his own pocket, which is sometimes done, the additional amount of \$200. What would be done?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That would not have any effect on it. The department does not contemplate allowance for clerk hire in the salaries paid third-class postmasters, though, as a rule, this class of postmasters do have to take care of a part of this expense from their salaries. The proposed amendment will correct that injustice to some extent and tends to give these clerks a living wage.

Mr. FOSTER. Your amendment would add 15 per cent to the amount allowed for clerk hire in third-class post offices?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, of course, you know it is optional with the Post Office Department. Heretofore they have been allowing \$600, and then there would be 15 per cent. If they would allow \$510 they will get just the same, would they not?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. They can not allow the lowest grade office over \$300 for clerk hire.

Mr. FOSTER. But suppose it were left optional with the Post Office Department.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That would incur the same additional appropriation, and it would be the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum.

Mr. FOSTER. It is optional.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; it is optional; but the Post Office Department can not increase them above these amounts. I am informed by the Post Office Department that they would like to have this authority if this bill passes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then they can not go above that?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. They can not go above that. It will involve an expense of \$300,000 additional. The allowance now is \$2,900,000, and it will increase this amount \$300,000 for the poorest-paid class of employees in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that these employees are usually paid very small wages.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. They are the lowest paid clerical employees in the service.

Mr. BARKLEY. The postmasters in these cases have a great many expenses of their own to bear?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes. I have an instance in my own State where a postmaster gets a salary of \$1,100. His original allowance for clerk hire was \$300, but that has been increased to \$400, the maximum for that grade office. This aggregates the magnificent total for salary and help of \$1,500. Due to the heavy work at that office it is necessary to employ two clerks, and the postmaster puts in about 10 or 12 hours per day himself. One of these clerks is paid \$600 per annum and the other young lady must certainly receive as much as \$400 per annum, which would only be \$33 per month. This deducted from the total of \$1,500 would leave the postmaster the princely sum of \$500 a year, or \$41.66 per month to maintain his family after working 10 hours a day.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand this bill, as it is now written, it does not provide any increase at all for clerks in third-class post offices or the postmasters themselves?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; it does not.

Mr. RUSSELL. It provides for all other clerks in post offices, but the third class gets no increase at all?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Under the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee the fourth-class postmasters get an increase in allowance for their own salaries, but they have no allowance for clerk hire. The clerks in the first and second class offices are taken care of in section 1, but no provision whatever is made for clerks in the third-class offices, whose wages are lower than any of the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] make a point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not; because I think it is just and fair that these men should be included.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, if we can have order for a minute, I want to say that I know the anxiety of the House to increase the salaries of everybody. Of course I appreciate the anxiety of my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] to increase the salary of that particular third-class post office, but we must remember that this comes out of the National Treasury.

I want to lay down a few propositions that are undoubtedly correct. The third-class postmaster is getting enough money now. That is the reason why he is not receiving an increase in this bill. There is no increase for the first and second classes. The lowest type of third-class postmaster is the man who gets \$1,000. That salary is based upon the receipts of the office, and it is adequate for the mail matter handled. The salary increases from \$1,000 to \$1,900 as the office progresses in importance and work, finally ripening into a second-class office at \$2,000.

Now, the department gives an allowance for these offices in accordance with the status of their work. They have the right to make an allowance up to \$800, and they can make whatever allowance is necessary, so that it is a self-evident fact that that third-class postmaster does not now get anything less than he deserves in accordance with the statute that grades the salary from \$1,000 to \$1,900. Then, again, he gets \$500 for rent, and he has \$100 for light and fuel, and there is no necessity for increasing the salary of the first, second, and third class offices. There is a reason for increasing the fourth class.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word or two in relation to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. It seems to me that in view of the fact that the Post Office favors this increase of compensation there is but little force in the suggestion that it is extravagant, and unreasonable.

It is a sufficient demonstration of the merits of this amendment, that it is supported, and I understand recommended, by the Post Office Department. I gather that much from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. This being so, I think that all of us can afford to vote for this amendment, *viva voce*.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have that amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 38.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers. Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. Moon and Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 64, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that has been on the desk for some time, and three other amendments were sent up since that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to call the attention of the Chair to it when he sends up an amendment. The Chair does not know what is on the desk.

Mr. LARSEN. I would like to be notified when my amendment can be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 2, line 20, after the word "received," strike out "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, can we have that amendment read again? I think that is in the third section.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply does for the laborers and other employees in the city post offices what the committee has already done in regard to the rural free-delivery carriers who receive less than \$1,200. The committee by amendment raised the increase in the compensation of the latter from 15 per cent to 20 per cent, and this does the same by the other postal employees.

Mr. Chairman, as I said on Friday, the question that is before this House now is not a question of raising salaries. It is simply a question of partially preventing a diminution in the actual compensation of a body of faithful Government employees. The fact that Congress for years has refused to do justice to Government employees until the time has come when it takes a large amount of money to do so is no argument against this legislation at all. As well might a man allow his bills to run until they get to be a large amount and then say that he will not pay any of them as to say that this Congress should not do justice now that this matter is before the House.

There is another consideration to which I wish to call the attention of the committee, and that is the connection between unjust compensation and poor service. Every Member of this House knows that the Postal Service of this country has been demoralized for some time. Every Member has had more or less unsatisfactory experience with his own mail. We know that the boys at the front are not hearing from home. I have letters every day from boys at the front who have been over there for months and who have never heard from their parents, although their parents have written them every other day. My colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] to-day called attention to the utterly unreasonable time that it took to get a letter to a major general over there. Now, what is the reason for this unsatisfactory postal service, both at home and abroad? One reason is because the present Postmaster General—and I am not criticizing his motive—has been trying to cut down expenses in order to show a surplus at the expense of impairing the service. He has opposed any proposition to pay the employees what they ought to have, he has refused to allow extra clerks and carriers where business has increased, and he has doubled up rural free-delivery routes and railway-mail routes until the whole postal service is demoralized. You can not overwork men and underpay them and refuse them justice and expect to get good service.

During this great emergency we should try to have the best postal service between the parents at home and the boys at the cantonments in this country. Above all, we should try to have the best possible service between the folks at home and the boys at the western front across the sea regardless of what it costs. This bill simply proposes to do partial justice to the postal employees of the United States, and I trust that this amendment, which is simply in the interest of fair play to the employees in the city offices, will be adopted just as the amendment to section 1 was adopted.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise to oppose the amendment?

Mr. GALLIVAN. To favor the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is anyone opposing it?

Mr. RUCKER. I am opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, in opposing the pending amendment I will take this opportunity, in the first place, to say that upon mature reflection I do not believe gentlemen can get any large permanent satisfaction out of criticizing a very faithful officer of this Government. I believe the Postmaster General is doing right in trying to economize, and to the extent that he does economize I justify his action and approve of his policies. Nor do I believe that the increasing of the salaries of those now engaged in the Postal Service is going to tend to give us very much more efficient service. If I correctly understood my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] who just preceded me, he thinks that to increase a salary will tend to secure more efficient service. I doubt that. If there is a man in this whole country to-day who will render more efficient service if you will give him a 20 per cent increase than he will without it, that man ought to be kicked by a Missouri mule clear out of the service, because he is not fit to be in it. He ought to give the best and most efficient service he can or quit the job.

Mr. Chairman, I think the increase of compensation provided for in this bill is enough. So far as I am concerned, I am not

going to vote for 20 per cent increase, because I think a 15 per cent increase is as much as should be provided, although I have a whole lot of Democrats in third-class offices in my district who, perhaps, would like to have me vote for this amendment. I will vote against it, because I think that is the proper vote to cast.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that is in order, with the amendment pending.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I shall have to object.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I understood we had 20 minutes on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty minutes. There are 17 minutes now remaining.

Mr. LARSEN. If five minutes are given to the gentleman from Massachusetts will that be taken out of the 17 minutes time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes regardless of the time remaining.

Mr. MOON. You can not do that.

Mr. DYER. You can by unanimous consent.

Mr. MOON. You can not get unanimous consent.

Mr. DYER. I ask for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] may proceed for five minutes, the time not to be taken out of the allotted time. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. There is objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I should like to ask how I can get five minutes?

Mr. MOON. The gentleman can get it on the next section if he will talk about the section.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I should like to reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], who has just spoken, and I would like to reply now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. DALLINGER) there were—ayes 22, noes 52.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL], a member of the committee, is recognized to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL:

On page 3, line 1, after the word "offices," insert "and railway postal clerks who perform service eight hours per day six days per week."

On page 3, line 5, insert "railway postal clerks" after the word "messengers."

On page 3, line 7, after the word "messengers," insert "railway postal clerks."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment applies technically only to railway postal clerks who are employed in what are known as terminal railway post offices. It makes the eight-hour day uniform as to all employees who are employed in post offices, whether they are clerks, carriers, or laborers. There is a class of railway postal clerks who are employed exclusively in terminal post-office service, who have an eight-hour day, but that eight-hour day may run through the entire 24 hours. This amendment provides that they shall be employed only 8 hours out of 10 hours, the same as clerks, carriers, and laborers. It simply makes the law uniform.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it possible to do that in the Railway Mail Service?

Mr. RANDALL. It is possible in terminal railway post offices. It would not be possible on the trains, but in the post offices it is possible and should be done if clerks distributing mail side by side are to be treated uniformly. I am very well aware that railway mail clerks, especially those assigned to terminal service, are not many in number and have not a legion of champions here, like the rural-route men, the post-office clerks, and city carriers have, but I appeal to the House to do justice. This amendment costs nothing, but it gives a class of employees treatment in hours of service on a par with their associates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RANDALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDALL) there were—ayes 11, noes 31.

Accordingly, the amendment was rejected.



Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, after the word "law," in line 11, page 3, the following proviso: "Provided, That all postmasters of the third class shall be allowed at least one clerk at a salary at not less than \$480 per annum."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make it?

Mr. MOON. Yes; I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after the word "hour," add "Provided further, That village-delivery carriers shall receive \$75 per month."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that. If the gentleman just wishes to talk for a while, I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am in dead earnest about this. I do not care to talk about it if the point of order is going to be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 19, after the word "compensation," strike out "is \$1,200 or less" and insert "is \$800 or less per annum shall receive 20 per cent increase in their compensation, and those whose compensation is in excess of \$800 and not more than \$1,200."

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, that amendment simply increases the wages to be paid to the low-paid employees provided for in this section up to 20 per cent, from 15 per cent; that is, those that receive less than \$800 per annum. It leaves those that receive over \$800 and up to \$1,200 at the same rate as provided in this section of the bill. There are a lot of employees in these smaller post offices who receive less than \$800 a year—assistant clerks, janitors, firemen, charwomen, and employees of that kind—and this proposed amendment simply increases their pay by 20 per cent, whether they are paid by the day, month, or year. For instance, it would give the man who now receives \$500, \$600; the man who now receives \$600, \$720; and the man who now gets \$800 would receive, if this amendment is adopted, \$960 per year. I think we all understand by this time that these poorly paid post-office employees are entitled to an increase in compensation, and the increase asked by this amendment is a reasonable increase. The postmasters of these third-class post offices have had entailed upon them, under the law enacted by the last Congress which went into effect during the last year, a duty that I have not heard referred to by anyone who has discussed this bill. There is established in every county in the United States a central accounting post office, that must keep accounts with every post office and rural carrier in that county, and that work is entailed upon the postmaster and his chief clerk, and not one cent of extra compensation is allowed for it. On page 25 of the Postmaster General's report of this year we find the following:

Under this statute passed last year the smaller post offices, known as district offices, now obtain their postage stamps and render their accounts through a central accounting post office in each county.

I wonder if there is any reduction in the expense of the Post Office Department here in this city because of the pitching over of all this extra work onto the local postmasters. There are in the congressional district which I represent 160 post offices and 115 rural routes, and every one of these rural routes and every one of the postmasters send their accounts into and obtain all their supplies from the central office. I have been in one of these offices there at 9 and 10 and 11 o'clock at night and have found the postmaster and the chief clerk poring over the little accounts that have been sent in, letters by the dozen from postmasters calling for stamps and supplies, and so on, and not one cent of extra compensation has been allowed them for that additional work.

These postal employees are the class that ought to be taken care of. Every man who receives less than \$800 a year as a postal employee is receiving less than a living wage. We have in my district 160 post offices and 115 rural routes, and many of those rural carriers receive far less than adequate pay. I will give three cases from the actual data furnished me as an example. Here is one that has to use an automobile and a two-horse team. His expenses run as high as \$71.75 in a single month, leaving him less than \$30 to live on. Here is another that uses a one-horse conveyance, and his expense amounted to \$40 in the month of September and \$34 in the month of October, showing that these men are all working for

less than a living wage, remembering that these men have families to support. I appeal here for those low-paid employees receiving less than \$800 a year and ask that they be granted the 20 per cent of increase.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to say that I represent a district somewhat similar to his, and there are cases there of central accounting postmasters, some of them of the fourth class, who are working 14 and 15 hours a day, and some of them are threatening to resign and will resign unless they get some relief. I want to see them treated justly, too.

Mr. ROBBINS. The clerk in the post office I refer to told me that he was going to resign because of the overwork. Another thing that has not been alluded to in this debate is this: You talk about the fact that these men are not paid, but I call attention to a large part of the population served by the rural routes that is not now being served at all, because the rural carriers are stopping, going away from their routes, and I know one route in the northern part of Westmoreland County, Pa., in my district, that is 10 miles long, and there has not been a rural mail delivery over that by a rural carrier for three months. The patrons have written me complaining that the rural carrier had abandoned the service and that all the fourth-class offices that formerly served these people had been closed when the rural service had been installed and now that the service of the carrier had ceased they had no mail delivery whatever and that they were 10 miles from a post office.

The mail is delivered there by the farmers taking turns by carrying it to the receiving boxes along the route because the rural carrier can not carry the mail at the miserable compensation that is paid by the United States Government for that service.

Let me give a few figures which were furnished me by these mail carriers to show how utterly impossible it is under present conditions for them to carry the mail at the compensation the Government pays for this service to rural carriers.

During the month of November this carrier, who uses a horse and conveyance, was compelled to give \$32 for his horse feed, \$4.80 for horseshoeing, and \$6.50 for repairs to his buggy, or a total of \$43.30, leaving him out of the \$100 compensation the sum of \$56.70 upon which to live and support his family.

Another carrier, who uses an automobile only, in September last he paid \$24.20 for gasoline, \$18 for auto tires, \$11 for repairs, and \$3 for oil, or a total of \$56.20, leaving him the sum of \$43.80 for his wages.

During November he paid \$24.50 for gasoline, \$21 for auto tires, \$12 for repairs, and \$3.10 for oil, or a total of \$60.60, leaving him \$39.40 upon which to live.

Take the example of another carrier, who uses both horse and wagon and automobile. In August, September, and October last, and it is a hard, mountainous route, the amount expended was \$191.56, leaving him \$108.44 for the three months, or \$36.13 per month.

Another one who carries by auto out of Greensburg, Pa., over improved roads, under the best conditions, expends \$42.17 a month, leaving him \$57.83.

I might multiply these examples, because I have scores of them that were furnished me by the mail carriers, but I filed a large number of these at the time of the hearings on this bill, and they are found on pages 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of the hearings given in detail, which was compiled by the carriers, showing the amount received and the expenses connected with carrying the mail over the rural routes, and showing the small amount that is left in each instance to them at the end of each month upon which they must live and support their families according to the American standard of living, which is the only one that any Government employees should have.

Mr. Chairman, these men live in civilized communities; they have families; they are human beings, and they ought to be treated as such; and they ought not to be humbled in the presence of their neighbors and their children excluded from school for the want of presentable clothing or their families starved at home for the want of the necessities of life; and it must be apparent to everyone here that a rural carrier can not support a family in a proper manner on the wages that are paid to these carriers.

Many of the rural carriers have quit summarily, and the routes are in some instances supplied temporarily and in many instances are entirely without service. Hence I make this plea not only for the carriers but for the good of the mail service and for the patrons who live in the agricultural districts and small communities of the country and who are now without mail service. I have filed protests with the Post Office Department and have always received courteous acknowledgments

and pleasant promises that the matter would be investigated and given due consideration, but the Post Office Department can not reestablish this rural service unless they are enabled to pay the carriers and the men who must do the work proper, adequate, and just compensation for the service to be rendered.

These carriers can not engage in any other kind of work. The horses they use are unable to do hauling or delivery work or cultivate farms or any other labor after the hard driving required by the rural carriers, and these carriers themselves after driving 24 or 30 miles are not in condition to take up additional labor, and they should not either be expected or required to do so.

There was a time when the rural carrier could make something by carrying packages and doing small errands for the patrons along the route, but this entirely disappeared by reason of the installation of the rural parcel post over its routes. Now all packages are carried at postal rates. The carrier receives nothing for this extra service; it is all paid to the Government. Yet the package business on the rural routes is increasing enormously. The farmers not only send their products to market, which is one of the beneficial purposes of this service, but the merchant sends by parcel post commodities to his patrons in the country. This is exactly what the Government wanted to accomplish. It is a benefit to the merchant and increased benefit to the patrons of the Rural Parcel Post Service. But, Mr. Chairman, it is very burdensome on the carrier to carry these packages and the mail, for which the Government is paid, but for which the rural carrier receives nothing—it is now all mail matter. He is required to keep up a stronger wagon, keep a larger conveyance, and his horses and conveyances are worn out and broken down by this extra heavy traffic, for all of which the Government receives compensation, but not an extra cent has been allowed to the carrier on this account.

This amendment, with the other amendments offered, is to take care of these underpaid Government employees. Why anyone should hesitate to vote for so meritorious a proposition I can not understand. I therefore beg of you, gentlemen of the House, to adopt this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania is very much in favor of this amendment and asked me to present it, as he was compelled to attend a committee meeting at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. ROBBINS) there were—ayes 43, noes 41.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Nineteen gentleman have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, page 2, line 24, the figures "40" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "50," and in support of that, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, strike out the figures "40" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "50."

Mr. JUUL. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, part of the section which I seek to amend is as follows:

That substitute letter carriers and substitute clerks shall receive as their compensation 40 cents per hour.

If a substitute carrier or a substitute clerk worked the entire full week his pay would be approximately \$19 per week, but he does not work the full week. He sits in the big post offices subject to call, and for the time he is waiting he receives nothing and the condition in some offices is such that the clerks have repeatedly come and sought to obtain leave of absence for months at a time so they might earn living wages elsewhere while the time they have to put in as substitute carriers might pass by until they could become regular. Now, we have been talking here about the war and appropriating money for the war.

I want to tell you there is something worse than war, and that is slow starvation, waiting week by week for the time to pass to know that you may receive enough money so that you can get three square meals a day, a place to sleep, and sufficient clothing to cover you; and I tell you that to-day there are not only dozens but hundreds of men who under the old pay of 35 to 40 cents an hour are unable to eat regularly. I submit to you that the United States Government, represented by you gentlemen here, ought not to want people to sit on waiting benches in

the post offices of this country at a rate of nothing an hour and take the chances of making the 40 cents per hour when finally put to work. If you give them 50 cents an hour for the number of hours that they might work in a week they might make \$18 a week, and I submit that you gentlemen know what an increase of 5 cents per day means when everything you buy is increased 100 per cent in many cases. I appeal to you, gentlemen, to strike out the figure "40" for these substitute carriers and clerks, and make it "50" cents. It is just, it is fair; you can afford to do it, and you ought to do it. You want nobody to serve the Government and starve while they are working and waiting. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert, at the end of the section, the following: "Provided further, That the increases herein provided shall apply only to such employees who are paid from the postal revenues and sums which may be advanced from the Treasury to meet deficiencies in postal revenues."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill providing for increases we excepted all employees paid from the postal revenues or from sums advanced from the Treasury to meet deficiencies in postal revenues. The phraseology of this section is broad enough so as to include some who are covered in the general increase of \$120 to all employees. For instance, janitors in post offices are paid out of the sundry civil appropriation bill and will receive the \$120 increase. Chauffeurs may be connected with the Postal Service and paid out of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. There may be per diem employees, and unquestionably the committee only desires to extend this increase to those who are paid out of the postal revenues. The purpose of the amendment is to carry that into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask to have the amendment again reported.

Mr. LARSEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia objects. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That postmasters of the fourth class shall receive the same compensation as provided by law prior to the passage of the act of Congress "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses and other purposes," approved October 3, 1917, except that they shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations up to and including \$100 quarterly.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moon: Amend section 3, line 18, page 3, by striking out the words "up to and including \$100 quarterly" and insert after the word "cancellations" the words "on the first \$100 or less per quarter instead of on the first \$50 or less per quarter."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in reference to the amendment, that fourth-class postmasters—that is, postmasters who receive less than \$1,000 for their services—that a great many of them do not receive more than \$12, \$20, or \$30. Many of the offices have little or no work to do at all, and are usually adjuncts to stores or business places. Under the law now they are paid—and I read from the statute so that the gentlemen may know just what these officials get if they have overlooked it—as follows:

The compensation of postmasters of the fourth class shall be fixed upon the basis of the whole of the box rents collected at their offices and commissions upon the amount of canceled postage due stamps and postage stamps. \* \* \* stamped envelopes, postal cards, \* \* \* canceled, on matter actually mailed at their offices, and on amounts received from waste paper, dead newspapers, printed matter, and twine sold, at the following rates, namely:

On the first \$50 or less per quarter, 100 per cent; on the next \$100 or less per quarter, 60 per cent; on the next \$200 or less per quarter, 50 per cent; and on all the balance, 40 per cent; the same to be ascertained and allowed by the Auditor for the Post Office Department in the settlement of the accounts of such postmasters upon their sworn quarterly returns.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does this section give any relief to fourth-class offices that have been made central accounting offices—more than it does to any other fourth-class office?

Mr. MOON. Not more than any other.



Mr. LANGLEY. Why did not the committee recognize the fact that their work has been increased much more than the others and make due provision for that?

Mr. MOON. If the gentleman will wait until I get through, I will reach his question. I do not want to speak on that now. Now, this amendment that I have offered here is to take the place of this language:

On the first \$50 or less per quarter, 100 per cent.

That is what they get now, and the amendment gives them on the first \$100 per quarter, 100 per cent. So it is an increase in that quarter of double the amount they are now getting. Where they receive \$50 now they will get \$100.

Mr. LANGLEY. But why did not the committee make some allowance in favor of the fourth-class offices that have been made central accounting offices, where their work has been nearly doubled, while the work of the others has not been?

Mr. MOON. There is a difference of opinion whether their work has been doubled or not. As a matter of fact, it is not so, as I am informed by the department.

Mr. LANGLEY. The department does not know anything about it, if it says that.

Mr. MOON. I am sure that what the gentleman knows personally about a place in Kentucky ought to control the whole country.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am not claiming to know about the whole country in this respect, but I do know of the offices in my section of Kentucky, and I am speaking for them. I know postmasters who pay part of their own salary to their clerks since this central accounting scheme came into operation. Some of them work 14 or 15 hours a day themselves in addition to the help they employ.

Mr. MOON. Is the gentleman going to ask a question or make a speech in my time?

Mr. LANGLEY. I would like to make a speech if I could.

Mr. MOON. I will let you quit right now.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is the gentleman's privilege, as he has the floor.

Mr. MOON. Now, Mr. Chairman, these fourth-class postmasters receive statements from other offices once a month, and tabulate them and send them on to Washington. It does not take two hours to do it.

Mr. RUCKER. I believe the gentleman made a statement which he did not intend to make a moment ago.

Mr. MOON. Let us see if I did.

Mr. RUCKER. That is what I am going to do if I can. I understood the gentleman to say that the amendment now pending at the Clerk's desk would double the amount that a fourth-class postmaster now receives on the first \$100 of cancellation.

Mr. MOON. Oh, no. I stated it would double the amount on the first \$100 received.

Mr. RUCKER. On the first \$100?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Is that right?

Mr. MOON. That is right. He now receives 100 per cent on the first \$50, and under the amendment he would receive 100 per cent on the first \$100.

Mr. RUCKER. What is he now receiving on the first \$50?

Mr. MOON. One hundred per cent.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to see if I am not right about this. On the first \$50 he gets 100 per cent, on the next \$50, and not exceeding, he gets 60 per cent, which would be \$30, would it not, and \$30 and \$50 will be \$80. Now, then, under this provision on the first \$100 he gets 100 per cent. Is not that \$20 more than \$80. It is \$80 of an increase instead of \$50.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER to the Moon amendment: Amend the amendment by inserting after the word "thereof" the following: "Such postmasters shall hereafter be allowed the sum of \$100 per annum, payable quarterly, for rent, fuel, and light: *Provided*, That whenever such post offices are kept in residences or in rooms in which other business is usually conducted the postmaster may, in his discretion, make such reasonable allowance for rent, fuel, and light, not exceeding \$100 per annum."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, let me state to the committee, and I can state it in a few words, is to supply what I think ought to be supplied to fourth-

class postmasters in order to enable them to perform their duty to the public with efficiency.

I do not want any gentleman here to make the mistake that is sometimes made in connection with these matters. I know there are thousands and thousands of fourth-class post offices in the United States that do not need or merit any especial legislation in their behalf. They are the little offices, sometimes kept in private residences, sometimes in storerooms, in drug stores, in grocery stores, and in dry goods stores, and so forth. They are usually solicited by the postmaster in order to help sell his goods, whatever they may be. The class of offices that I am trying to benefit by this amendment is a better or higher class of offices, those offices which in a few years in the ordinary course of affairs will become third-class offices, offices which now pay from \$600 to \$700, \$800, or \$900.

When the office becomes a third-class office the Government pays for rent and fuel and light, the rent being at the usual rental value of the property in the town. I have presented here a plain, flat proposition to allow all postmasters who maintain post offices in separate buildings separate and apart from any other business—in obedience to the will, or very probably the demand, of the community, \$100 to compensate them for rent and fuel and light.

Now, mark you, the \$100 will not cover it all, because \$5 a month for rent is too low, and \$30 for fuel for a year and \$10 for light is too low. I am not trying to wholly reimburse the postmasters, but I am trying to give them \$100 more than they now get, because I believe they ought to have the additional allowance and thus be encouraged to maintain a post office where the public business may be transacted.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am in favor of the proposition of the gentleman, but I do not think it goes far enough. In addition, he does not provide especially for the class of postmasters that I referred to a moment ago—those who have an accounting office. I have an amendment that I want to offer on that point.

Mr. RUCKER. I will say to the gentleman that it has not been the policy of the Post Office Department to allow any extra pay on account of an office being made an accounting office. That applies to second and third class offices as well as fourth-class offices. The pending substitute also provides that where a post office is kept in a store building or a residence, perhaps, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, allow a reasonable sum for rent, leaving it wholly to his discretion. However that discretion may be used it will probably be used wisely, because, in my judgment, they ought to have but little compensation. But in a nice little town where there is seven or eight hundred population, where there are two or three banks, where the cancellations amount to enough to pay the postmaster under existing law \$750, for instance, I believe we ought to furnish a room for him to do business in, especially where he maintains that room. I know that all over the country little post offices are kept in that way. In my district there are a number of them.

Let me say to you that I have some very pathetic letters from postmasters of this class, one man suggesting that his salary during the last calendar year was but \$750, but that the work, by reason of the parcel post, made it necessary for him to have his wife as his assistant most of the year. The total pay is \$760, out of which he has to pay rent and fuel and light for the building in which he keeps his post office. I know that man well, and I know that his story is true, and he tells me he is suffering from an affliction and that he tried to save enough money to enable him to go a hospital to be treated; but he did not have the money to do it in that quarter, and in the last quarter he has been trying by the closest economy to save the amount of money necessary to defray his expenses at a hospital. Two people ought not to be required to work for the public a whole year, furnish rent free an office, furnish fuel and light for such a pitiful sum. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman from Missouri left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, under the rule adopted by the House limiting debate, all time has expired. No; I am mistaken about that. I move to limit debate on this section to 10 minutes further.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MONTAGUE). The Chair did not catch the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. I will modify that, and move, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be concluded in 20 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOON. I will make it 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be concluded in 20 minutes. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FIELDS. I want to know if the Chair got the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee to make it 30 minutes?

Mr. FOSTER. I move to amend, Mr. Chairman, by making it 20 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have an amendment that I desire to offer to this section, and I want to inquire whether I would still have an opportunity?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee and make it 15 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I thought the Chair had recognized me to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not recognize anybody during a division. A division is called for. The question, as the Chair understands it, is the motion to extend the time of this debate on this section and all amendments thereto by 10 minutes, making it 20 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. "Thirty minutes" the gentleman from Tennessee said.

Mr. MOON. My motion was that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto should close in 30 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] moved to amend by making it 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I moved to substitute 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The division is upon the original motion.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make this point of order, that all of these substitutes and amendments were out of order, because we were in the act of dividing on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled that such motions are out of order.

Mr. THOMPSON. I want to find out whether the motion was 20 minutes or 30 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON. I want to find out. The gentleman can not cut me off in that way, even if he is from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, and on that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMPSON] demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 103, noes 10.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] will be adopted. I had a similar amendment in my hand which I intended to offer, and therefore I am glad to support the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri. I believe it is just and right. The Government pays for fuel and light and rent for first-class post offices, where the Government also furnishes the office and the equipment and pays all the expenses. The Government pays the expenses of second-class post offices in the same way, and it pays the expenses of third-class post offices by paying rent, fuel, and light.

The Government in practically all the places where first-class post offices are located, and in many places where the second-class post offices are located, owns a public building, and in addition to providing the building itself provides all the furnishings and equipment in the building, including fuel and light and every convenience and comfort necessary for the transaction of the public business. The postmasters, therefore, at these first-class and second-class offices are furnished all their necessary equipment, and the postmasters at the third-class offices are furnished their rent, light, and fuel, but it is very different with the postmaster at the fourth-class post office.

When it come to the fourth-class postmasters—and they are as deserving as the first, second, or third class postmasters, but they receive very different treatment at the hands of the Government, because all the conveniences that the Government

can furnish are given to the first and second class post offices, and third-class post offices receive pretty fair treatment, whereas no provision is made for the fourth-class post offices at all—the fourth-class postmaster has to provide the house in which his office is located, all equipment, fuel, light, and everything else, and the remuneration he receives is in very many instances small. While others are being considered here it is time to do something for these faithful and deserving public servants. They are entitled to the allowances proposed, and I trust they will receive it. I make this appeal in the interest of justice and fair play to these postmasters of small offices. They receive but little. Give them this very reasonable allowance. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. Does this amendment which the gentleman is advocating leave it to the discretion of the Postmaster General or does the provision require the payment of this \$100 a year?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The provision requires the payment of \$100 a year except under certain conditions, when the post offices are in stores, residences, or things of that kind, and then it leaves it to the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. STEVENSON. Where the post office is in a separate building.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Where the post office is in a separate building, the amendment gives \$100 a year.

Mr. MOON. In a great many places where the salary as fixed under the law does not amount to more than \$25 a year, does the gentleman think it fair that there should be an allowance of \$100 a year for rent?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; that would be covered under the discretion given the Postmaster General, and he would have to investigate that.

Mr. MOON. Does not the gentleman think the Postmaster General ought to be allowed full discretion and control?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This amendment, I think, gives discretion and control to the Postmaster General under the circumstances suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee, as I understood it when read by the Clerk from the desk; but where it is a separate office, and where a considerable building is required and considerable equipment has to be provided because the volume of the business makes it necessary, then it provides that this appropriation of \$100 a year shall be made for rent, fuel, and lights, which would not in many cases be a sufficient sum under those circumstances; but the postmaster himself would, even then, in many cases have to pay a considerable part of his bill for rent, fuel, light, and equipment out of his own pocket, as he pays it out of his own pocket now. I say that these fourth-class postmasters are entitled to some consideration along this line, and I sincerely hope Members will give serious consideration to this amendment and vote for it in justice to these efficient and faithful servants of the Government. [Applause.]

I understand the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] will offer an amendment in reference to the situation where a fourth-class post office is also a central accounting office. That is another phase of this situation deserving attention, and I hope that matter, when presented by him, will have serious consideration.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If I have the time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I just want to point out that the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] a few minutes ago has some force in it. Take the case of a fourth-class postmaster receiving \$25 or \$30 a year; he could very well undertake to build some little building in which to maintain his post office, and in that event under this amendment he would be absolutely entitled to the \$100.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. No; I think he would come under the second provision of the amendment, which leaves it to the discretion of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General would not permit a subterfuge to be resorted to, but would decide each case on its real merits.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But that is only where the office is in a store or residence.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If he built a little addition to his residence or store it would still be discretionary with the Postmaster General whether to make the allowance or not. I think we could safely trust the Postmaster General to take care of the Government's interest and at the same time do justice to the fourth-class postmasters under this amendment if adopted. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. He might make it a separate building.



Mr. RUCKER. Suppose a man does want to build a little separate building. If he puts up a building that the people of the community will tolerate for a post office, he ought to have rent for it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], there are many of these offices—I think I have as many of them as any Member of this House—where the compensation does not amount to more than \$30 or \$40 or \$50 a year. Now, to allow the postmaster \$100 a year in addition for rent would be entirely out of proportion to the importance of the office, and would be an imposition on the Government.

Mr. RUCKER. Is not every one of the offices where the salary is so small maintained in a store?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Many of them are maintained in dwelling houses.

Mr. RUCKER. But a man would not go to the expense of putting up another house simply for the sake of this allowance.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; he would to get the hundred dollars.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not think he would.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer, but during the parliamentary wrangle which occurred a little while ago I did not get the opportunity to offer it. I desire to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to read this amendment:

Such postmasters shall hereafter be allowed the sum of \$100 per annum, payable quarterly, for rent, fuel, and lights: *Provided*, That whenever such post offices are kept in residences or in rooms in which other business is usually conducted the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, make such reasonable allowance for rent, fuel, and light, not exceeding \$100 per annum, as he deems just.

As has been intimated, if you give this \$100 extra, in addition to the 100 per cent proposed by the amendment that I have offered, that will increase the salary 100 per cent on the first quarter and then will give this \$100 extra, and you will not find any of these little post offices any longer in stores or residences. The man will simply build himself a little shack in the corner of his lot, which may not cost him over \$20, and will draw \$100 a year from the Government and get this 100 per cent increase, and it will be one of the best-paying things in the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. There are over 40,000 of these offices, and \$100 a year to each one will be \$4,000,000.

Mr. MOON. I do not assume to reflect on the judgment of the House in any way, but while we have made some pretty wild movements about this proposition, in my opinion none would be more shameful than the adoption of a thing like this. You gentlemen all feel that you are very strongly backed in your movement about this overwhelming increase of salaries that you propose over and above the very liberal proposition provided in the bill. I want to tell you that there are communications coming to our committee room in this hour of peril and danger to our country that are more patriotic than following the lead of the postmasters, carriers, and postal clerks. I want them to have ample compensation and no more. To-day I had a letter from a very patriotic and capable citizen who lives 8 miles from a post office. He said that the farmers in his section of the country who have sent their sons to war, but can not go themselves, feel that the expenses in the Post Office Department and all departments of the Government ought to be retrenched and the money put into munitions of war. He suggested that we wipe out the Rural Free Delivery Service entirely during the war; that the people in the country can get along without it while we are fighting the enemy; and that would save the Government \$53,000,000, which would help pay the expenses of the war. He suggested that we take away five out of the seven or nine deliveries in the great cities, which would save \$50,000,000 more. And you, gentlemen, in the midst of the most perilous conditions that have ever affected the world are absolutely taking the money out of the Treasury and giving an increase in salaries, not temporary but permanent, to nearly every official of this Government. I am for this bill. I reported it by direction of the committee, and I favor it, but this bill as it came from the committee has added about \$25,000,000 to the salaries of the postal officials. We thought that was enough. If you persist in the amendments that have been offered and pass those now proposed, I shall be forced at the end of this bill, in order to cover the expenses that it carries, to move an appropriation of more than \$50,000,000 for salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes.

Mr. MOON. I do not want any more time.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to answer a few questions.

Mr. MOON. I do not want any time, and all debate has been exhausted on this section, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. RUCKER. I have another amendment that I want to offer.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Alabama an amendment by way of substitute?

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that I reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to say a word. The paragraph that is under consideration is to provide an increase of compensation to fourth-class postmasters. Their present compensation is based upon the cancellations, carrying in percentage according to the amount of cancellations. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rucker] provides for something of an entirely different character. It provides for an allowance to these fourth-class postmasters for rent, light, and heat. Under existing law there is no authority whatsoever for paying any allowance to fourth-class postmasters for rent, light, and heat. There is, however, authority at law for making an allowance to postmasters for rent, light, and heat in the first, second, and third class offices.

The CHAIRMAN. If we have an increase of compensation by way of light and allowance for heat and rent, would that increase the compensation?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this provision alone relates to compensation for services of fourth-class postmasters and is limited to the existing law in the way of computing it. The committee brings in an amendment that seeks to change the present basis of compensation. If you are going to carry the rule to the extent intimated by the chairman of the Committee of the Whole, then you would make in order an amendment that would provide for his living expenses. You could say that the fourth-class postmaster should receive an allowance for the support of himself, his wife, and his children, and as many other relatives as you see fit. Certainly the Chair would not hold such an amendment to be germane, and yet, following out the logic of the intimation of the Chair, that this allowance in the way of rent, light, and heat would be germane, it would follow necessarily that an allowance for his own support, for the meals that he would take in the post office, or for traveling expenses from the post office to his home, expenses of every character, would be germane. There is no allowance under existing law granted fourth-class postmasters for light, rent, and heat, and if the Chair would hold this amendment to be in order he would have to hold one granting an allowance for any character of support or maintenance of the fourth-class postmasters. The Chair would have to hold in order an allowance for fixtures and furniture, and if you were to go to the extreme you would hold in order an amendment for an allowance to authorize the postmaster to purchase the real estate on which the post office was located, or to pay him an allowance for wall paper, for carpets, for beverages, or any character of expenditure. I submit that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is not an appropriation bill, as the gentleman argues, but is a legislative bill. Then, again, this provision seeks to increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters and therefore is directly in harmony with the text of the paragraph reported by the committee. The text which this seeks to amend is clearly subject to a point of order, and if that is subject to a point of order, propositions to amend it are in order. I submit to the Chair that it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I say a word on this point of order? I would say in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rucker] that this is not an appropriation bill, that this suggestion has no significance in this connection. The question of the germaneness of an amendment is a principle that applies to any other bill, as well as to an appropriation bill, and the only question in connection with the amendment under consideration is whether it is germane to the subject matter of this particular section. As to whether this section is out of order, or not, brings up another principle. It would be out of order but for the rule, but the rule makes in order the section and all germane amendments to the same. I submit that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri goes outside of the action contemplated by the section. The section provides for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters within certain limits, and in a certain prescribed manner, and it would be perfectly competent to

offer germane amendments to this plan of increase and within those limits, but you can not go outside of those limits and submit a system of allowances for these fourth-class postmasters not contemplated by the original terms and purpose of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment to the amendment is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment which even the gentleman from Tennessee will admit is in order. I move to strike out the \$100 in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee and insert \$150, and I want to be heard on that.

Mr. MOON. Offered where?

Mr. RUCKER. On the gentleman's amendment; I do not know where. I will ask the Clerk to read the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Moon amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER to the Moon amendment. Strike out "\$100" where it appears the second time and insert in lieu thereof "\$150."

Mr. MOON. What sort of a looking thing would it be when that is done?

Mr. RUCKER. I really do not know, but it will look just as well as it will with the amendment the gentleman has offered. I will tell the gentleman that. Mr. Chairman, I want to amend my motion so as to strike out the "100"—

Mr. MOON. Let us have a vote.

Mr. RUCKER. No; I am going to talk on this amendment. I want to amend the Moon amendment by striking out "100" in both places and inserting "150."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend just a moment. The figures only appear once.

Mr. RUCKER. That is the place I want the figures "100" to go out. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to present a few commonplace remarks here. A marvelous condition exists. I heard the distinguished gentleman, parliamentarian, and statesman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] on Friday prove by the record which he held in his hand that it cost a rural carrier in his district about \$700 a year to equip himself. Is not that right?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is on those routes—

Mr. RUCKER. On routes near where some of these fourth-class postmasters live.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. On those routes where a man has to provide both a motor car and two horses, but not on all.

Mr. RUCKER. Seven hundred dollars necessary expense, where they only get \$1,200 for doing the work; and yet the gentleman stood here and told us with pathetic eloquence that moved the House about the condition of the poor rural carrier in his district, due to the high prices prevailing everywhere; and yet when it comes to men filling other places—public servants—in order to defeat them the gentleman says that men somewhere, perhaps in Virginia, would take advantage of the phraseology of the amendment offered by me and build houses for \$25 per house and rent them to the Government at \$100 per year. My God, is everything high down there in Virginia, except building houses? [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, if this committee wants to defeat this amendment, why, defeat it. But I insist that it ought to be on reason and logic and not such argument as that made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], because, I tell you, where it costs \$50 or more to feed a horse one month it will cost more than \$25 to build a house which even the citizens of a Virginia community would permit a Virginia postmaster to maintain a post office in. It is rot to make such argument, and no one will be deceived by it, I hope. Now, I want to pay my respects to the chairman of this committee [Mr. Moon], the distinguished jurist, who asked me in what sort of condition this amendment would leave his bill. Why, my God, it can not be worse disjointed than it is now. Any kind of change would improve its appearance.

Mr. MOON. Does not the gentleman think it would rather deform a bill when he—

Mr. RUCKER. With the improvement my amendment would make, this bill as amended would make the whole country smile like the smile on the gentleman's face, that never comes off except when he occasionally gets in a colloquy with gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished jurist and logician who wrote this bill—presumably because, I am sure, he would not let anybody else write one of

his bills, nor will he allow anybody to improve his bill—this gentleman tells the House seriously that the amendment he has offered doubles the amount that the fourth-class postmasters get on the first \$100 of cancellation under existing law, and I tell him he is wrong—

Mr. MOON. I want to say this to the gentleman—

Mr. RUCKER. His amendment only provides an increase of \$20 per quarter more than such postmasters now receive under existing law—an increase of \$80 per year for the poorest paid of all Government employees.

Mr. MOON. The language of this bill is not exactly as it was given to the printer and is dubious, and the purpose of the amendment I offered was to make it clear that they would get not 50 per cent of the first \$100 salary received, but the whole of it.

Mr. RUCKER. Does not your proposition simply give the fourth-class postmaster \$20 a quarter more than he gets now?

Mr. MOON. Not by quarters. As the proposition now stands in the present law, on the first \$50 collected the first quarter he would get 100 per cent; under the amendment he would get 100 per cent not on the first \$50, but the first \$100.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. I ask five minutes more time, because the gentleman has taken up the best half of my time in making that speech.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has had a lot of talk this afternoon and would not permit me five minutes a moment ago.

Mr. RUCKER. I?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, I would like to know how much time there is left.

The CHAIRMAN. That takes all the time.

Mr. MOON. I think that would hardly be fair.

Mr. RUCKER. I will take two minutes of it. I want to be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question.

Mr. MOON. I have not the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. No one has the floor. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. Gentlemen, I say to you, in plain figures, dollars and cents, the provision suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] gives to fourth-class postmasters the munificent and magnificent increase of \$80 a year and no more—

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Make it short.

Mr. BLACK. I want to state that it makes in all \$1,900,000 a year.

Mr. RUCKER. It may do it. We are spending money by the billions. I am not talking about that. I am appealing to these gentlemen who determine the amount of pay that all the clerks of the Government shall receive. I tell you that I fear somewhere way down in the hills and mountains of Tennessee, in the beautiful resorts and luxurious homes there, I am afraid the language of the poet Longfellow is applicable. You remember the stanza of three or four lines, in which the poet says:

The blind man is poor, and blind a poor man is.  
The former sees nobody, the latter nobody sees.

And I tell you somewhere in this land people can not or will not see the poor devil who performs the work, with his wife at his side helping him to toil and labor for the public for \$600 or \$700 a year; but when it comes to the high-class fellows, who through organization make themselves felt, then even the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] sometimes responds to them. I take the side of the poor devil and, with an approving conscience, take my chances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER. Division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the vote be taken again. You said "the gentleman from Tennessee."



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state it again.

The vote now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a division, because I am sure many of these gentlemen did not understand it.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 73.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANGLEY: Amend the Moon amendment by striking out the period, inserting a colon, and adding the following: "Provided, That postmasters of the fourth class whose offices have been made central accounting offices shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations up to and including \$200 quarterly."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have already said in the colloquy with other gentlemen about all that I care to say on this subject. I desire to emphasize this point, however, and that is that these central accounting offices of the fourth class have had their work largely increased as compared with the other fourth-class post offices; and while I think all fourth-class postmasters should be allowed more under present conditions, I feel that it is only just and fair that this amendment that I have offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, giving special recognition to that kind of fourth-class postmasters, should be adopted in order to give them at least some extra compensation for the greatly increased amount of very onerous work that they are now doing. I want to repeat the statement that I made awhile ago, that I know of some fourth-class postmasters who are doing this central accounting work who tell me that they can not live on the amount they have left after deducting the amount they have to pay for additional clerical help, to say nothing of the double work they do themselves, and that they are going to resign unless Congress gives them some relief.

Mr. MOON. Do you desire also to increase the salaries of those in the first, second, and third class offices?

Mr. LANGLEY. O, I think they all need relief, but I am like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], I am for "the poor devil" first. [Laughter.] They need help the most. Moreover, the larger offices are already getting more liberal treatment, and with the aid that has already been given them in this bill they will be much better fixed than the fourth-class offices are. I want to help them all, but let us help the most needy first, and more liberally.

Mr. MOON. You are looking at the fourth-class post offices?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; because they are nearly all of the fourth class in my district and need help the most. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Has all time expired, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one minute remaining.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is too short a time.

Mr. MADDEN. The accounting offices in the counties referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] are not fourth-class offices at all. The accounting of all the fourth-class post offices in each county is transferred either to a third-class or a second-class or a first-class office.

Mr. LANGLEY. When was that done?

Mr. MADDEN. That has been done by the order of the law passed by the Congress of the United States, and there is no necessity for this additional compensation, and it ought not to be granted. The amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky ought not to prevail.

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman ought not to misinform the House.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is simply mistaken. He does not know the facts. There are five of them in my district, and many more of them in other rural sections of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit a unanimous-consent request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. The rule was fixed, Mr. Chairman. I do not like to object. The gentleman can speak on the next amend-

ment. I think we ought to take the vote of the committee on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee objects. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not know whether I correctly understand; and what did the Chair understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to say?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUCKER. I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUCKER to the Moon amendment: Add at the end of the Moon amendment the following:

"Such postmasters at offices where the annual pay is not less than \$500 per annum shall hereafter be allowed the sum of \$100 per annum, payable quarterly, for rent, fuel, and light: *Provided*, That whenever such post offices are kept in residences or in rooms in which other business is usually conducted the Postmaster General may in his discretion make such reasonable allowance for rent, fuel, and light, not exceeding \$100 per annum, as he deems just."

Mr. MADDEN. I make a point on that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made. The point of order is sustained. The vote recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Postmaster General shall have authority to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star-route and screen-wagon service, with a view to adjusting compensation, and adjust the same in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment.

Mr. ROUSE, Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LARSEN, and Mr. MONTAGUE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROUSE], a member of the committee.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSE: Page 3, line 21, after the words "service," insert "and contracts for supplies."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the amendment. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROUSE] want to be heard?

Mr. ROUSE. Not on the point of order, but I want to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment gives the Postmaster General the right to investigate all contracts for supplies of the Post Office Department. This section provides that he shall investigate the contracts for star-route and screen-wagon service, and it is no more than right that he should have the authority to investigate all contracts.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROUSE. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I would like to ask the gentleman if any contracts for the hauling of the mail between the railroads and the post office are included in star-route contracts?

Mr. ROUSE. That should be included in section 4.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is included in the screen-wagon service?

Mr. ROUSE. Yes. It should be.

Mr. HAMLIN. I know of one or two instances where the railroad station is located a mile and a half from the post office. The transportation of the mails from the station to the town is let by contracts. Would it include that?

Mr. ROUSE. That is termed "messenger service."

Mr. HAMLIN. I thought that perhaps the language used in this paragraph would not cover that.

Mr. ROUSE. It will not. The section refers to the screen-wagon and star-route service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. ROUSE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The word employed by the gentleman from Kentucky, as I understand, is "supplies"?

Mr. ROUSE. Yes; "supplies."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman think the word "supplies" covers printing contracts and contracts for paper and envelopes, and things of that kind?

Mr. ROUSE. I will say to the gentleman that is exactly the intention of my amendment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, from the reading of the section to which the amendment is offered, it appears that it is sought to authorize the Postmaster General to investigate conditions solely as to contracts in star-route and screen-wagon service, with a view to adjusting the compensation. That is the main purpose of this section, and I assume that another purpose is to increase the compensation if these contractors engaged in this service.

The amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROUSE] introduces an entirely new character of investigation by the Postmaster General that is not in any wise connected with compensation for the service referred to in the section. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], a leading parliamentarian of this House, directed attention a moment ago to the fact that in determining germaneness to this bill, in the case of amendments that are offered, attention must be given to the subject matter of the paragraph or section under consideration, and it rests upon the Chair to determine what that subject matter is. The question before the Chair is, supposing there was a bill presented for consideration in this House, in regular order, which contained only one section—namely, section 4, vesting authority in the Postmaster General to investigate conditions solely as to one subject matter, and that related to compensation—whether it would be germane under the rules of the House, when a bill refers to but one subject matter, to introduce another subject matter which is in no wise related or akin to it.

There have been many decisions made by various occupants of the chair which have held that in order for an amendment to be germane it must be akin and related to the subject matter; that where a bill relates to but one subject matter—as with this section, and that is seeking to increase compensation—you can not introduce another amendment, even of the same kindred character. The general case cited is the case of a bill providing for the admission of one State to the Union, where it would not be germane to provide for the admission of a second State.

By this amendment the Postmaster General is to be authorized to investigate contracts of an entirely different character, contracts relating to supplies, with which compensation for service is not related. It is something apart from the purview of the section, and, with regard to the merits, the amendment would open the consideration of contracts of an entirely different character, involving many millions of dollars, which is not only indefensible, but which the rules of the House say shall not be admitted under color of germaneness when there is only one subject matter under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROUSE. No. If the Chair sustains the point of order I shall offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSE: Page 3, line 20, strike out the words "conditions arising from contracts in" and insert in line 20, after the word "investigate," the words "or contracts including."

Mr. ROUSE. I think, Mr. Chairman, that will take care of all the contracts in the department, so that no point of order can be sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order to that amendment. The gentleman's amendment goes further. There is nothing more fundamental in the rules and precedents of this House—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. In a moment. There is nothing more fundamental in the rules and precedents of this House than that in a provision that relates to a single subject matter you can not offer an amendment which relates to a generality of matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood the gentleman a moment or two ago to say that the substance of this proposition was compensation.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If you adhere to compensation as being the substance of the proposition, then the question of service is an incident, and you can extend it to any sort of service or contract and the compensation for that service.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman fails to recognize that in a bill limited to one subject matter you can not introduce an amendment that will extend it to the subject in general.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The gentleman from Virginia recognizes the argument made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, namely, that he contended compensation was the substance of the proposition, and I am simply trying to hold the gentleman to his own argument. If the gentleman's argument is right, that compensation is the substance of this proposition, then I maintain that contracts for supplies are incidents. If you reverse it, then it may be that the gentleman is correct, but he thereby recedes from his own argument.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not backing down from the original proposition, because that was a different case presented than what is now presented for the consideration of the Chair. The only question was whether you could add a second matter to a provision that related to only one subject matter. Now the amendment is of a different character entirely. The amendment that is offered in the nature of a substitute provides for a generality of all contracts, and I can cite the Chair to decisions on the subject of germaneness, that where a bill relates to one single matter you can not offer an amendment general in its character to extend to all subject matters.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has my attention.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to suggest to the gentleman the equities of a case, with the hope that upon reconsideration he will withdraw his point of order. I am now recurring to the original proposition. It is perfectly obvious that its purpose is to give permissive authority to the Postmaster General to correct certain contracts the performance of which works manifest wrongs and inequities to one party to the contract. May I cite one instance in order to make myself clear to the gentleman?

Mr. STAFFORD. I might be influenced not to press the point of order if this matter had been investigated by the regular committee of the House, and that committee had had the matter brought before it for consideration. But here the gentleman asks me to withdraw the point of order upon a subject matter which has not been given consideration by the duly authorized committee of the House—a matter which may involve the Government in an expenditure of tens of millions of dollars. I recall one case, in connection with the contract for the manufacture of embossed envelopes, where the Postmaster General, with questionable authority of law, changed that contract, which involved the expenditure of many millions of dollars, which enabled the Postmaster General to grant increases over the contract price by providing for a quality of envelopes different than had theretofore been provided.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When the gentleman gives his illustration, will he permit me to give one?

Mr. STAFFORD. On the merits. I wish to discuss the point of order further.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to get the converse of the proposition in the gentleman's mind. I know of a contractor who undertook to do printing for the Government. The estimates were given to him that the printing would not exceed \$80,000 for four years. Of course the mere letter of the contract gives the Government the right to require him to do 80 times \$80,000 if it sees fit, but when the contract was entered into assurances were given him that \$80,000 would be the maximum for four years. But because of this war the Government has demanded from him more printing in one year than he would have had to do in five years. Owing to the increased cost of labor and paper he is losing enormous sums of money, and the Government is driving him into bankruptcy. He asks that the Government may have authority to release him and not to drive him into ruin. In cases of that sort it seems to me the Postmaster General ought to have permissive authority to investigate and respond to the plain equities and justice of the case.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there is an administrative officer of the Government who is performing that character of an unconscionable practice—

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Government is adhering to the contract. It is the contract that is unconscionable.



Mr. STAFFORD. Then some remedy general in its character ought to be provided in a bill introduced and referred regularly to the proper committee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How can we get a remedy when the gentleman interposes points of order against everything?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has been long enough in this Chamber to know that the only protection to this Government is to invoke points of order, and that the proper remedy is for the gentleman to introduce a bill and have it take the regular course and be reported upon by the department, or else there will be no protection to the Treasury in these times.

Now, on the point of order I merely wish to say—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield further.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In order that the gentleman may not impute to me negligence I was going to offer an amendment somewhat similar that would have been acceptable to the entire committee. It was not my purpose—

Mr. STAFFORD. Why has not the gentleman been before the committee in the regular way?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have been before the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit me—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The section under discussion deals with authority to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star-route and screen-wagon service, a matter relating to the transportation of the mails. The amendment would seem to open it to any kind of an investigation—with relation to buildings or anything else. The Chair thinks that the amendment is not in order, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LARSEN: Page 3, line 23, after the word "adjustment," insert "Provided, That in no case shall an increase of more than 15 per cent be allowed."

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to limit the increase which the Postmaster General shall be permitted to make in existing contracts.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order at the proper time. I am one of the Members of Congress who heretofore has not taken up the time of the House, either in offering amendments or in discussing such bills or amendments as were before it. I came here with the belief that it was best for a young Member to sit and listen to the older ones for a while. I have been here for nearly a year, and I have heard a half dozen men, or perhaps a dozen, at most, who have grown old here in the service talk continually day in and day out. I have not been greatly edified by such talk. [Applause.] I regret to say some Members remind me of corn in the roasting-ear stage, the time when the grain is the largest. When the silk dies the grain begins to shrink and harden; before long the weevils are in it and it is unfit for use. Some of our Members undoubtedly came here in the roasting-ear stage. They have been shrinking ever since they came, the weevils have got into them, and I think it is time they were relegated. [Laughter.] The committee, it seems, desires to be very brief at times. The chairman of the committee, when the previous section was under consideration, made a motion that we have 20 minutes in which to discuss the section and all amendments thereto. The committee, the chairman principally, took up practically all of the 20 minutes, and other Members of the House who wanted to offer amendments and who wanted to be heard on the section were denied the privilege. Do you think that is right? I ask the membership of this House, is it right or just? [Cries of "No!"] I am here, I hope, to stay for some time. I propose to be heard on this and other matters now and hereafter. [Applause.] I have sat here, I believe, for a solid month, all put together, and have listened to speeches delivered by consent agreement by the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and yet when I come before the House and ask that I may have five minutes he is the first gentleman on his feet to deny me that humble privilege.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. No; I will not. The gentleman has been heard too much already.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. LARSEN. I desire to say to the Chairman and to the members of this committee that I think I am throwing a little

enlightenment on this bill, and I believe I am serving a good purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the gentleman shall talk to the amendment.

Mr. LARSEN. I object to being interrupted by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. LARSEN. And I will reply to the gentleman's point of order by saying his conduct shows that he does not know what I am discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will proceed in order.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Georgia will not get anywhere talking that way.

Mr. LARSEN. I think it is a dangerous precedent for this Congress to permit any man to be clothed with such authority as this section gives. It puts unlimited authority in the Postmaster General to investigate contracts now being performed on star routes and in screen-wagon service. It gives him authority to add any amount as compensation to such contracts he may see fit. If the Government were losing money on such contracts, no adjustment could be made. Perhaps if gentlemen of the committee, especially the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], had given that due consideration to the bill that it deserves he would have discovered this very grave mistake. When such a bill as this is brought before the committee, and it seeks to give unlimited power to one man, it seems to me that it should be scrutinized closely.

It should be justified by facts and circumstances, and the authority to increase compensation should be limited. My amendment provides that he shall not increase the amount beyond 15 per cent. It simply limits the amount of the increase. It is just, it is equitable. If the Postmaster General looks into these contracts and decides that they should be increased, he has the right to do it, but in no case could he increase the amount more than 15 per cent. That is about the amount of increased compensation we have granted to the employees of the Government. I expect the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and perhaps some others will be opposed to it because it seems that it would do justice to the common people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LARSEN. Now I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order made by the gentleman to be pressed?

Mr. MOON. Oh, if the gentleman had been here a little bit longer he would have known that the point of order was not very much in earnest.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that my friend from Georgia is so outraged as he seems to be and that he has not heretofore manifested to the House his splendid ability. I know that if this committee that he criticizes could have had the benefit of his profound judgment and experience in legislation it is possible that some of these sections might have been changed very much; but I am glad to have the assurance that hereafter we shall have the benefit in this House of his ability—not discovered until the gentleman announced it himself a few moments ago.

Mr. LARSEN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MOON. No.

Mr. LARSEN. I am not surprised that the gentleman has not discovered it, for he has not discovered any feature in anything.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, an estimable gentleman, and, as he says, a new Member, upon that ground must be overlooked and excused for some of the things that he has said and some of the reflections that he has cast. After he has been here a while he will learn, I think, that there may be some one else who knows something. A new man when he gets here thinks that there is never anyone here but himself.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me ask him a question.

Mr. MOON. Oh, I suppose I shall have to; yes.

Mr. LARSEN. Is it not also a fact that these old men have about made up their minds that there is nobody here but them? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. No.

Mr. LARSEN. Does the gentleman not think that they are suffering from the same complaint?

Mr. MOON. No.

Mr. LARSEN. Is not this the trouble with the gentleman? You older men are so jealous of your authority—

Mr. MOON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that the gentleman from Georgia does not appreciate the fact that under the rules of the House that the members of the committee have to manage this bill and any and every bill, and we do that the best we can, and I know we will be able to do better hereafter with his assistance than we have heretofore, and I am glad that we are to have him.

Mr. LARSEN. One more question, if the gentleman will permit me, and then I will be through.

Mr. MOON. Oh, no; I do not think it necessary to answer any more questions. Now, Mr. Chairman, to be serious about it I do not have any serious objection to the gentleman's amendment as far as I am concerned, but I do not think it would be a wise thing for the House to limit the Postmaster General in his discretion. Some of these contracts for an amount paid in excess of 15 per cent ought to be allowed for adjustment. Some of course ought not to be. When you give discretion to a public officer and limit it too closely then it is valueless for the public service and is valueless to the man who is seeking relief. Unquestionably some of these contracts are made where the relief asked for ought to be greater than 15 per cent; somewhere it ought to be less. I think that the House ought to vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment—

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FIELDS. I desire to offer a substitute to the section. When is the proper time?

The CHAIRMAN. After the section has been perfected, then the motion to strike out and substitute will be in order.

Mr. FIELDS. I ask unanimous consent to have it read now, and that it may be pending.

Mr. BURNETT. Not in my time, I hope.

Mr. FIELDS. I do not want to cut the gentleman out of his time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out in the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia the figures "15" and insert instead "20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] the figures "15" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "20."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, that would be more in line, it seems to me, with the action of the House last week. In reply to some of the remarks of the chairman of the committee I thank the Lord, and there is not a man in this House who does not, that the committee was not allowed to manage this bill entirely last week but that the House took the bit in its own mouth and had something to say about it. Now, the committee is evidently trying to manage that part that refers to the star-route men in a manner adverse to the star-route carriers, and I hope they will find some friend on the floor of this House to look after them, if there are only a few of them. [Applause.] It is a crying shame that this committee or anybody would allow this discretion to the Postmaster General, in the face of what we know—that he tried to nullify the law in regard to the rural carriers, and did nullify it until this House passed a law directing him in terms in regard to it. We should not leave this discretion in the hands of the Postmaster General. I merely offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman, as an amendment, hoping that substitutes of other gentlemen that will come later will not be declared out of order that will fix definitely and absolutely some standard of measure, and that we will try to do justice by these men in order that they may have some sort of an increase given to them in positive terms. I say to you, gentlemen of this House, that if it is left to the Postmaster General whether these star-route men shall get an increase I very much fear that he will never give it to them. Now, I believe there are gentlemen—

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question for information?

Mr. BURNETT. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. I understand the gentleman's amendment does not take from the Postmaster General any of the discretion, but limits it to 20 per cent instead of 15 per cent, as contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BURNETT. This is an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia in view of the fear that

I have that other amendments giving them more may be declared out of order—

Mr. MOON. But the gentleman does not propose to take the discretion away by his amendment at all, does he?

Mr. BURNETT. In other words, that it may go to the extent of 20 per cent instead of 15 per cent. I am opposed to the limitation proposed to be fixed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, and by my amendment also, but if we are to have a limitation I prefer 20 per cent rather than 15 per cent.

Mr. MOON. A further question. The gentleman leaves the discretion still in the Postmaster General's hands, but he amends it so as to make it so that he may be permitted to go to 20 per cent in the amount, but suppose these friends of yours you are talking about have contracts where in order to relieve them he would have to give 30 per cent or 35 per cent, ought that discretion be left to the Postmaster General to do that?

Mr. BURNETT. No; he ought not to have any discretion at all, but some fixed rule ought to be adopted for the increase, and I hope the amendments that are adopted later on will take such discretion away from him.

Mr. MOON. A further question there. Inasmuch as this is not a salary proposition but is a contract proposition, where one contract may be made for one sum and another for another, thousands of contracts applying in different sums of money, how could you pass a law, a mandatory act, that would require the allowance of a certain amount or a certain per cent by the Postmaster General without bringing about a condition that would fit one case but not another? Would it not be impossible?

Mr. BURNETT. In regard to the discretion?

Mr. MOON. The amount of discretion in fixing the amount.

Mr. BURNETT. I am not for fixing it absolutely, and if I can have the assurance—

Mr. MOON. The point I am making is that you can not do that. It might be a proper rate in one case and may be bad in another. Some of these contracts are very valuable to the contractors, and some of them are not. You can not do that.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, that can easily be arranged by taking into consideration the increased cost and expense of carrying out each contract, and then allowing these percentages of increase to be based on those increased expenses. Now, there is a way to get at it, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me. I am not afraid of some of these subordinates of the Postmaster General not doing right, because I believe they will, but when the iron heel of the Postmaster General is placed upon these men they do not dare do what they would believe to be right. And is it equity and justice—

Mr. MOON. May I ask the gentleman a question? Is it the purpose of the gentleman to fix an amount that must be allowed to the star-route contractors?

Mr. BURNETT. Not a fixed amount. That, as the gentleman says, can not be—a fixed percentage for each carrier. But certainly there can be an allowance based upon the expense that he has incurred and the additional expense that has been incurred since the beginning of this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] be extended one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. Now, will the gentleman give me his attention for just a minute? Do you want these allowances made to the contractors or the subcontractors? You know the contractors are all making money out of these star routes, and it is the subcontractor who takes it at a much less amount than the contractor who is probably losing money. Are you for the relief of the contractor, or the subcontractor who does the work?

Mr. BURNETT. I know, Mr. Chairman, that there was a time when a man in any locality of the country could go into this bidding business, but now it is arranged so that the bidder, as I understand it, has to live along the route, and I am wanting it fixed so that the man who does the work may get the pay, whoever he may be, whether contractor or subcontractor. Now, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN], because I do not believe there ought to be any limitation; but I had rather see 20 per cent than 15 per cent if there has to be any limitation, and that was my only reason for offering my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.



The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is not in order.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Section 4 provides:

That the Postmaster General shall have authority to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star-route and screen-wagon service with a view to adjusting compensation and adjust the same in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment.

And the gentleman from Georgia proposes to limit that authority to 15 per cent and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] proposes to limit it to 20 per cent. The gentleman from Alabama comes up here and professes to be a friend of the star-route men, but his amendment is directly opposed to their real interest. Under this provision, if it passes and becomes a law, the Postmaster General, when he finds upon investigation that the star-route contractor is losing 50 or 100 per cent and ought to be relieved, can grant the relief; but under the provisions of the amendment he is limited in that relief to 20 per cent.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. STEENERSON. Not now.

It seems to me that the friends of the star-route carriers, of whom there are a great many in the United States, ought not to be deluded into supporting either one of those provisions. There may be cases where the loss to the star-route contractors amounts to 100 per cent, and they would go bankrupt in a short time, and the Government of the United States would not be benefited by putting them in bankruptcy, and the Postmaster General is granted, by this, authority to adjust the matter according to equity and justice. Therefore I am opposed to both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question? I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks the present Postmaster General will give the star-route carriers any increase under this section?

Mr. STEENERSON. The Postmaster General has requested this provision. He sent it to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and requested that he be authorized to investigate and grant the relief. The gentlemen are going off on a tangent about the Postmaster General not being willing. It is an administration matter, and I have no doubt he will exercise the authority in the interest of fairness and justice both to the contractors and the Government.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN. I want to ask you this question: Do you think it would be proper to increase the compensation of the contractors on the star routes in a greater per cent than other employees? Do not you think 15 per cent is a very reasonable increase on account of the increase in the cost of living?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not agree that you should limit it to 20 per cent or 15 per cent. I believe this provision is all right the way the committee reported it. Give the Postmaster General the power to investigate and correct any injustice there may be in the contract. There are cases where the loss exceeds 20 per cent. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer another amendment, when the right time comes, to section 4.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment already pending. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAMLIN: Page 3, line 21, after the word "routes," insert "messenger service between railway station and the post office."

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. Before the gentleman begins I desire to move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to make the motion?

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not. I suggest, however, to my friend from Tennessee that if he thinks this amendment is subject to a point of order he should make the point of order and state why. If it is subject to a point of order, I do not care to take up the time of the House in discussing the amendment.

Mr. MOON. What is your amendment?

Mr. HAMLIN. My amendment is to add "messenger service between railway stations and the post offices."

Mr. MOON. I do not object to that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

Mr. HAMLIN. What is the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. That it is adding a new activity, and that is against the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The point of order is overruled, and the gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to take care of a service that is not included in the bill. I was not certain whether the star-route or the screen-wagon service mentioned in the section would take care of these contracts made for hauling the mail between the railway station and the post office, where the station is located outside of the town, and upon inquiry of the chairman of the committee having charge of this bill he admitted that it would not take care of that service, because that service is designated as "messenger service."

I have in mind a particular case, called to my attention this morning, where the railway station is situated about a mile and a half from the little town in which, of course, the post office is located. Now, that service of hauling the mail from the station to the town is let by contract. The complaint in this particular case is that under present conditions the party performing that service now is doing it at a loss and wants some relief.

I think that kind of service ought to be included in this section of the bill, so that the Postmaster General may have authority to adjust that kind of service just as well as the star-route or screen-wagon service. That is all there is to it. I want to provide so that in cases of this kind relief may be granted, if in the wisdom of the Postmaster General he thinks it is justified. That is all I care to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DOUGHTON, and Mr. MOON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] is recognized.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves—

Mr. MOON. In 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on the section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my substitute and offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FIELDS: Page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out the words "shall have authority" and insert "is hereby authorized and directed."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to hear that amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, nearly two days have been devoted to the interests of rural carriers and clerks, but largely to the rural carriers, who have an organization throughout the country, and I am for them and have voted for their increases. But gentlemen have overlooked the fact that more than one-fourth of the carriers of United States mails in the country are star-route carriers, and they are the poorest paid men who are working for the Government of the United States in any capacity. There are 43,318 rural carriers and 11,029 star-route carriers. The star-route carriers, however, have no organization. If those 11,000 men who are carrying the mail on star routes had an organization, I will warrant you that they would receive more recognition in this bill and in this House.

We heard much in the beginning of this debate on the bill about justice, but as the hand of organized labor is withdrawn from this Chamber, the form of justice goes with it.

What are these star-route carriers getting? As I said, they are the poorest paid men in the service of the Government, and

the fourth-class postmasters are the next poorest paid. Many of the star carriers are going into bankruptcy. I intend to offer an amendment before this debate closes which will authorize and direct the Postmaster General to make investigations and increase their compensation in proportion to the increase in the cost of the service since the contracts were awarded under which they operate.

What has brought about this great increase in the service that they are required to do? The parcel post. Many men are operating their routes now with two horses and a wagon, whereas at the time they took the contract the mail was carried with one horse, in an ordinary pouch, and the work performed by a boy. But because of the increase in the parcel-post matter they have been compelled to put on a team. The boy who could formerly ride the horse and carry the pouch can not handle the team. Therefore it has become necessary to hire a man and pay him a man's wage. A few days ago I received a letter from one star carrier who is getting \$2 a day, and the actual cost of operating the route is \$5 a day. I have a letter from another man who gets \$1.80 a day, and the actual cost is \$3.20 a day. These are only two out of hundreds of letters that I have received. The only difference that this bill makes with regard to star carriers is to authorize the Postmaster General to make such investigations as he cares to make and such adjustments as he may deem proper. That is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. The matter should not be left to the discretion of the Postmaster General. The bill should specifically provide for an increase in the compensation of star carriers and certain fourth-class postmasters, and I hope that the substitute I shall offer later on may be adopted, which will give the star carriers an increase in proportion to the increase of the service on the routes since the contract under which the carrier is operating was awarded.

Gentlemen, it is nothing but fair and just. First, the star-route carrier performs the service for half or less than half what the rural carrier receives. Take, for instance, two routes in one county in my district. They pass over the same sort of territory. They are the same distance. I got a rural route established over one of them two or three years ago. The only difference between the one over which the rural route is operated and the one that still remains a star route is that there is an unbridged stream on the latter, and for that reason I could not secure the establishment of a rural route over it. On this one which still remains a star route there are just as many boxes as there are on the rural route. There is a box at every home. The star carrier performs the same kind of service that the rural carrier performs. He collects the mail from the office and deposits it in the boxes of the patrons of the route and collects their mail from the boxes and carries it to the post office. He receives \$548 per annum, while the rural carrier on the other route receives \$1,080, and many others in the star service are working for much less than the amount that is paid to the star carrier to whom I have just referred, and, as I have previously stated, the amount of mailable matter has so increased since their contracts were awarded because of the increase in parcels post and other mailable matter, due to the general increase in business, that many of them have been forced to double or more than double their facilities, and this hardship, in addition to the increase in the cost of feeding their animals, is forcing many of them into bankruptcy. Yet they are under a bonded contract from which they can not resign, while the rural carrier can resign; so, in view of these conditions, the compensation of star carriers should be increased, and I sincerely trust that the amendment that I shall offer at the proper time in the nature of a substitute will be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment there is no more meritorious section of this bill than the one which undertakes to afford relief to these parties. I would not favor a proposition which sought to compel the Government to supplement the amount of a star-route bid to such an extent that the contractor would be guaranteed a profit. The equities of the case do not call for such a guarantee, nor is that what is proposed to be done by this section. Many of the star-route contractors are men of small means who undertook these contracts on a very narrow margin of profit. In a number of cases the margins were so close, that the contractors were in substance hiring themselves and their teams to the Government, at a very modest wage. These contracts were made one year, or more ago. Since that time we all know that great changes have occurred throughout the entire country in the items of living cost for man and beast. A very large proportion of the Members of this body represent country districts, and are familiar with the conditions I am describing. I think I am

justified in appealing to these Members to confirm all that I have said with reference both to the small margin of possible profit in a large proportion of these contracts, and the plight in which the contractors now find themselves, in consequence of supervening conditions. Many of these contractors are discharging their contracts at a daily, and ruinous loss.

Mr. MONDELL. May I give my testimony on that point to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly. I will be glad to hear from the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true over the entire intermountain west at this time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. With respect to these contractors the bill does not undertake to provide that the Government shall guarantee them a profit. Not at all. But it is proposed that when the Government shall have ascertained by proper inquiry that any contractor as a result of conditions that he could not anticipate, is carrying out his contract at a loss, even when exercising the utmost economy, and good judgment, a supplementary allowance may be made sufficient to save the contractor harmless, or in the exercise of further discretion by the Postmaster General that the contract may be canceled, and the route relet.

Mr. RUCKER. If a fourth-class postmaster was renting a house, and his rent was increased, why would not his condition call for the same relief?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The case suggested, is by no means analogous. I think that I have as many fourth-class postmasters in my district as any other Member of this body, and I am as anxious as anyone, to protect their just rights and secure their proper interests, but the situation of the fourth-class postmaster is very different from that of the star-route contractor. As I have said, it is not proposed that the Government shall guarantee any star-route contractor a profit, but without the relief contemplated by this bill many of these small contractors will be absolutely ruined, if held to the letter of their contracts. It is not a case of sympathy for one or more contractors who exercised poor judgment in respect of their bids. The present unhappy situation of these contractors is due to supervening conditions which they could neither anticipate, nor control.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman is well posted on this subject?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have tried to secure the facts both as to the circumstances under which these star-route contracts were made, and the present plight of the contractors.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], a while ago, made the statement that there are no longer any fourth-class post offices that are central accounting offices. Is that correct?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not able to answer the gentleman's question. On principle a fourth-class office ought not to be an accounting office. These offices ought to settle their accounts with an office of a higher grade, a second, or a third-class office. But some fourth-class offices, may be accounting offices. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] ought to be able to answer this inquiry.

Mr. MADDEN. I think I know that there are no fourth-class offices that are accounting offices.

Mr. LANGLEY. What do they do in a county where there is no presidential office?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. This has nothing to do with the argument that I am making.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Illinois is not correct, that is all.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. All that I wish to say in conclusion is that many of these little contracts for carrying star-route mail have been undertaken in good faith by men of limited means on a narrow margin of profit. As a result of supervening conditions a number of these contractors are executing their contracts at a ruinous loss. Some authority ought to be given to the Government under which a measure of relief in the way of a supplementary allowance, or a cancellation of the contracts, may be afforded to these contractors.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think the section of the bill that is under consideration gives sufficient authority?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It is to that section of the bill that I am addressing my remarks. In this connection I will say that the section ought to be amplified by an amendment that will hereafter be offered. A final word with respect to the difference between the condition of the postmasters, the rural carriers and the other postal employees, and the star-route con-



tractors. A postmaster, or a carrier, or a clerk can at least throw up his job, and undertake something else.

Mr. RUCKER. But can not the star-route contractor do that as well?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No, he can not. He is bound by a contract which he has made with the Government, and for the fulfillment of which he has given bond and ample security. That is the essential difference between him, and the other parties mentioned. He is compellable to carry out his contract. That is the law.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have one in my district that has a five-year contract with a bond under it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Every star-route contractor is required to execute a bond with security to carry out his undertaking. Mr. Speaker, this is a highly meritorious bill which will correct hardships growing out of war conditions. It should receive the hearty support of the Members of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. DOUGHTON: Strike out all of section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Postmaster General shall, as soon as practicable, investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star-route and screen-wagon service with a view to adjusting compensation in all cases where the present compensation is inequitable. Whenever the Postmaster General upon such investigation shall ascertain that any star-route contract or screen-wagon contract was entered into prior to the entrance of the United States into the war with Germany, and that the compensation agreed to be paid in said contract is at the present time inadequate, by reason of the increase in the cost of materials, labor, and maintenance of equipment employed in the performance of such contract, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed, upon the request of the contractor and his bondsmen, to cancel the same or readjust the terms of said contract in such manner as to relieve the contractor from the hardships being by him suffered on account of such increased cost and expenses."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire me to make the point of order or to reserve it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I would ask the gentleman to reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOON. After the gentleman has talked on it for five minutes, I shall make the point of order.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I observe that the gentleman in the first part of his amendment followed the language in the original bill. Would the gentleman be willing to modify his amendment so as to insert the amendment the committee adopted a few moments ago at my suggestion?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have no objections to that.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be so modified.

The CHAIRMAN. As to include messengers?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes; between the railway stations and the post office.

Mr. CANNON. Does that include the railroads that have to deliver the mail?

Mr. HAMLIN. No; those stations located outside.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be so modified.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, section 4 of the bill, as I understand, has for its purpose the granting of relief to the star-route carriers of the country. I think it will be admitted by all who have taken the pains to investigate that the star-route carriers are the poorest paid of any of the Government employees. They hold these contracts under a four-year contract. In other words, the contracts are awarded as the result of competitive bidding and for a term of four years. The present contracts were entered into June 30, 1916, and expire June 30, 1920.

I fear that if the language contained in the bill is adopted, it is so ambiguous and weak, that the purpose sought will not be accomplished. If I thought it would be I should not offer the substitute, but I can not see any harm in directing the Postmaster General to make this investigation. The language in section 4 authorizes him to make the investigation, while the language in my substitute directs him to do so; and if he finds on such investigation that as a matter of fact the compensation paid is unjust and inequitable, he is then directed, upon the request of the contractor and his bondsmen, to either cancel the contract and readvertise or make such adjustments as are equitable and just. I think the fairest solution of this whole matter is this, that as these services are being performed under the contract system if the contractor is not satisfied and is suffering a loss, and the contract is unjust and inequitable and a hardship is being imposed upon the carrier, then for the Gov-

ernment to readvertise the routes and open them up to competitive bids.

Mr. MONDELL. These contracts only have about three months to run.

Mr. MADDEN. They are pretty nearly through.

Mr. DOUGHTON. About three months? How do you figure that out? They expire June 30, 1920.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, in the gentleman's section they do.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In my section they do.

Mr. MONDELL. In my section the four-year contract expires the 1st of July next. The gentleman's substitute invites the Postmaster General to cancel these contracts. I think the Postmaster General will be very glad to accept such an invitation as the easiest way out, in which event these contractors who have been carrying mail at a heavy loss for two or three years will not be reimbursed. It occurs to me that you are not helping the contractor by suggesting to the Postmaster General that the contract be canceled.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not yield for a speech. I do not understand that under the bill the contractor will be reimbursed by any legislation we can enact. I am trying to prevent his sustaining further loss.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, if the routes are readvertised in the light of present conditions, why these men, if they wish, as well as others, can bid with their eyes open, and the Government and the bidder are placed upon equal terms. If the contractor is forced to carry out his contract with the present high prices for material, labor, and everything that goes to make up his equipment practically doubled in price he will, in many cases, be bankrupt. Not only is the contractor liable himself but his bondsmen are cocontractors, and if he fails, as he is doing in many instances, his bondsmen are forced to carry out the contract entered into by the contractor.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, there has been no legislation offered here during this term of Congress, in my judgment, that would come to the relief of a class of people that are standing in greater need of relief than the star-route people.

At the time these contracts were made, as a result of competitive bidding, the prices then paid were very low, not more than half the average price paid to the rural carriers for performing similar service, and entirely out of proportion to the work performed. However, had not conditions been so radically and adversely changed by the war these carriers would have no moral grievance, having entered into these contracts voluntarily, but they could not foresee the coming of the war, and consequently should not be held to a performance of the contract when in so doing it means their ruin.

These men have no organization through which they can speak and bring their troubles to the attention of the Congress as do other postal employees. However, I have received hundreds of individual letters from all sections of my State begging and appealing for relief. One man says his expenses alone are \$50 per month, and he gets \$28.69, which leaves him a loss of \$21.31, and nothing for his own time. I have many letters showing conditions equally as disastrous as this one.

Gentlemen of the House, no class of Government employees perform a more essential service than do the star-route carriers, or services that are fraught with more difficulty. Many of them have schedules which start as early in the morning as 5 or 6 o'clock, which, as you know, is long before daylight in the winter time. Traveling at a distance of from 30 to 35 miles, and in some cases 40 miles per day, over rough roads, breaking the ice in the streams, battling with snowdrifts, and other difficulties incident to rough roads and bad weather. Then when they get to their destination are forced to wait, in some cases two or three hours, in order to make connection with some other mail before they start on their long, wearisome journey homeward. In many cases it is 8 or 9 o'clock at night before their day's work is completed.

Gentlemen, it is for this humble, honorable, underpaid, and overworked class that I lift my voice and plead, that they may be given, not a profit but simple justice and a reasonable wage for their difficult service. Unlike other postal employees, they can not throw up their jobs or resign at will, but are tied securely by heavy bonds for the faithful performance of their duties.

Of all the requests that have come or will come before this Congress for relief, none will be so meritorious as this one.

Early in this session of Congress I appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and requested that the pending bill contain a section granting certain relief in some form to the star-route carriers and I appreciate the fact that the committee has written this section in the bill; and while I think it should be amended by the adoption of the substitute which I have offered, or something similar, yet I feel that in

any event, when the bill is finally approved, that it will be in such form as to afford a reasonable measure of relief.

There are doubtless a few instances where the carriers are receiving a reasonable compensation, and for this reason I would not favor a percentage increase, but the Postmaster General should be authorized and directed to investigate all cases where complaint is made, and where he finds the compensation now being paid is inequitable and unjust, the contract should be canceled and the route readvertised in the light of present conditions, or an increase in the present compensation should be allowed which will be commensurate with the increase in the expense incident to the carrying out of the present contracts. Not to grant this relief in some form would, in my judgment, be nothing short of a grave crime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. Does the gentleman from Tennessee press his order?

Mr. MOON. The point of order is all right—

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin want to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will indulge me for a moment, I make the point of order that the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute is not germane to the section which it seeks to amend. The language of the section presented to the committee for consideration is limited solely to authorizing the Postmaster General to investigate conditions arising out of certain contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the fact that the committee has adopted an amendment that authorized and directed him to investigate and compensate.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was not aware of that amendment having been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. It was adopted.

Mr. MOON. I would ask the Chair to have the amendment read. I do not think it went quite that far.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman suspend just a minute? The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

Mr. STAFFORD. That was rejected.

Mr. HAMLIN. My amendment was not that one.

Mr. STAFFORD. That amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOON. The amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in error. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. STAFFORD. The amendment did not provide for compensation, but as it was rejected I will proceed with my argument. The section merely provides for investigation.

The amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina not only provides for investigation but offers virtually an amendment to the existing section directing the Postmaster General, not merely authorizing him, but directing the Postmaster General upon the request of the contractor or the surety to the contractor to cancel the contract, thereby relieving the contractor of an obligation that he now owes to the Government, a matter entirely apart from the subject matter presented to the House for consideration. The subject matter to the section before us is merely investigation, and I direct the attention of the Chair—

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask attention of the gentleman to the language in line 22: "And adjust the same in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment."

Mr. STAFFORD. Leaving it, as the Chair notices, to the discretion as to the adjustment, where in his discretion it is advisable, but in this amendment it takes away the discretion entirely and directs him to cancel the contract. The theory upon which the amendment of the committee is predicated is that there shall be an investigation and leaving it to the discretion of the Postmaster General. Here, if the Chair holds this amendment to the section in order, another amendment will be in order fixing the salary, fixing the compensation that may be paid these various star-route contractors, and certainly the Chair would not hold that an amendment fixing the compensation that may be paid to these various contractors, whether a per cent of increase or definite amount, would be in order. The amendment offered compels him to cancel the contract, virtually takes away from him discretion instead of leaving it to him to determine when the contract shall be modified, and says the contract upon the request of the contractor or the surety company shall be immediately terminated. That is not akin to the matter presented by the committee, and I call the attention

of the Chair to the citation found on page 345 of the Manual on the subject of germaneness, where it says:

To a bill modifying an existing law as to one specific particular, an amendment relating to the terms of the law rather than those of the bill—

Is not germane.

This is something that relates to the terms of the contract and is not related and differs entirely from the provision carried in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to be heard?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, so anxious to criticize the language of the amendment, being in a difficult situation in his effort, after having put on his glasses, read into my amendment, or substitute, language not contained in it. The gentleman said it calls for the immediate cancellation of the contract. I do not have the amendment before me, but—

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. If I have made a misstatement, I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the language of the gentleman's amendment say that the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed, upon the request of the contractor or the surety company, to cancel the contract?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Or readjust, certainly; or readjust, but the gentleman said "immediately," but it is not immediately. He is to investigate.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this substitute is germane because it relates entirely to the purpose sought to be obtained, and that is the granting of relief to star-route carriers; and, of course, so far as the contention of the gentleman from Wisconsin is concerned, "immediately" was not written into the language. It first authorizes the Postmaster General to investigate, and then if he finds these contracts are unjust and inequitable he can cancel or readjust along the lines of equity.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that particular?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, the gentleman, I think—

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman desires to make a misstatement.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am not making a misstatement, as the gentleman did when he read into my speech language I never used.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the point of order.

I am not in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], but I have an interest in the correct and proper parliamentary usage of the House, and I am very much surprised that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] should urge at length that the amendment is not in order. It is clearly in order. This is a provision for the readjustment of the star-route contracts. It is a provision taking up star-route contracts with a view to readjusting them. Congress having entered upon that sort of a procedure, can take such action as it deems wise and best in regard to star-route contracts. The amendment proposes an adjustment of compensation by relieving a contractor of any further service. That is one way of adjusting compensation. I do not care to take the time of the Chair to any great length on a matter as simple and plain as this. There can be no question but what the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Under the amendment, as I understand it, relief is only granted to those contractors who made their contracts before we entered the war—a year ago. I would like to have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again read.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. HAMLIN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. If I understood the Clerk to report that amendment correctly, he left out the modification that the gentleman from North Carolina very kindly made—railroads and post offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair remembers that the amendment was modified. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] will state wherein the amendment is not right.

Mr. HAMLIN. Insert after "star route" the words "messenger service between railway station and post office." That was my amendment.



The CHAIRMAN. The vote then recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. Division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the vote on?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina to strike out the section and substitute.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I have an additional substitute that I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has expired. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute of Mr. FIELDS: Strike out section 4 and substitute the following:

"SEC. 4. That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate conditions arising from contracts on the star-route and screen-wagon service, and whenever it is ascertained by such investigation that there has been an increase in the amount of the mailable matter handled by such contractor in the star-route and screen-wagon service since awarding the contract under which he is at the time operating that a corresponding increase in the compensation of such contractor shall be allowed during the duration of the contract."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. FIELDS. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 3, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," providing increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than \$480 and not exceeding \$1,000 per annum, shall apply during the fiscal year 1918 to all watchmen, messengers, and laborers.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a moment to explain what I understand to be the purpose and intent of section 4, the readjustment of the star-route contracts.

There have been some misleading statements in regard to that section, and I think the matter ought to be cleared up a little. Under that section as the committee wrote it, and I think the committee wrote it in good form, it becomes the duty of the Postmaster General, as it is, I understand, the desire of the Postmaster General, to investigate these star routes and make a thorough investigation, not only with regard to the increases of the amount of mail, but with regard to the increased cost of carrying the mail from any cause, and, having made these investigations and learned the facts, to adjust the compensation as he sees fit and believes is fair, just, and equitable. He can pay the contractor any additional sum he believes equitable, and which under the circumstances he believes the contractor is entitled to. Now, that is very much better than a provision inviting him to cancel.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Under this could he cancel a contract?

Mr. MONDELL. I doubt if he could; but if he can give the contractor sufficient allowances for his losses in the past, and sufficient for the future, to make his contract a reasonably paying one, that is better for the contractor in the majority of cases than to cancel the contract. At any rate, it is better than an invitation to the Postmaster General to cancel contracts that have run three years and a half already in the intermountain country. The cancellation of such contracts would be the easiest way for the Postal Department to wash its hands of all responsibility. What we want them to do is what they, I think, wish to do, make an examination and give reasonable compensation for past losses and for the future.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Take line 23, beginning with the word "where," on line 22, "where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment," does the gentleman think the word "necessity" there is a proper one?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not like the word "necessity." I think some other word might better have been used. Where the facts disclose that it is proper and just and equitable to do it is what it means. The necessity for adjusting the pay in order

to do justice is what the word "necessity" means in such a case.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That this act shall be in force and effect from and after its passage. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

Mr. MOON. I will ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the consideration of that section be postponed until we have finished the other sections of the bill permitted to be introduced under the rule.

Mr. STEENERSON. Why not strike it out? It is absolutely useless.

Mr. MOON. I think we had better wait until we reach the close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the consideration of the section just read be postponed until the other sections of the bill permitted to be introduced under the rule shall have been disposed of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment provided under the rule and have it read, and then I will make a motion that the committee rise. I send the amendment to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

I.

That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer, and the delivery of articles necessary in the production of such food products to the producers, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes in the vicinity of such cities of the United States as he may select, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the cost of such experiments, not exceeding \$300,000, may be paid by the Postmaster General out of any unexpended appropriations of the Postal Service, and the Postmaster General shall report the result of such experiments to the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. —. That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver and turn over to the Postmaster General from time to time, and without charge therefor, for use in the Postal Service, such aeroplanes and automobiles, or parts thereof, as may prove to be, or as shall become, unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to use the same, in his discretion, in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof out of the appropriation for inland transportation by steamboat or other power boat or by aeroplanes or star route.

SEC. —. That from and after the passage of this act the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may require the payment of postage on mail carried by aeroplane at not exceeding 24 cents per ounce or fraction thereof.

II—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. We are considering this bill by sections.

The Clerk is proceeding to read another section.

The CHAIRMAN. It was sent up to the desk merely to be read.

Mr. MOON. To be read as section 6.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will they be considered section by section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that it is offered as one section.

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not believe I will consent to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk was about proceeding to read the second section of this amendment.

Mr. MOON. It is offered as one section to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it is offered as one section to the bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then there will be no opportunity to consider it section by section?

Mr. MOON. That is a section itself. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CARAWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADDITIONAL SECRETARIES OF WAR.

The SPEAKER. The chair is informed that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], who was appointed on the confer-

ence on the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes, is not in town and will not be for several days. Therefore the Chair appoints Mr. ANTHONY in his place.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9903. An act to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9571. An act to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 3445. An act to authorize the payment of gun pointers and gun captains while temporarily absent from their regular stations, and for other purposes;

S. 3130. An act to amend section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3129. An act to provide for the disposition of the effects of deceased persons in the naval service;

S. 1546. An act to permit the use of certain refined products of petroleum as stores on steam vessels carrying passengers;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations; and

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. DAVIDSON, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for one week, on account of death in his family.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE WAR-RISK INSURANCE BILL.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate joint resolution 133, and ask that the House insist on its amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate and that the conferees be appointed.

Mr. GILLETTE. What bill is that?

Mr. BARKLEY. The joint resolution amending the war-risk insurance bill, permitting insurance by prisoners.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky calls up Senate joint resolution 133 and asks that the House insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. The Clerk will report the resolution by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution 133, authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I assume the gentleman desires to insist on the House amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the House insist on the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. SIMS, Mr. RAYBURN, and Mr. WINSLOW.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga., for the purpose of determining what erosion is taking place and what improvements are necessary to prevent the same in the interest of navigation; also the consideration of any proposition for cooperation on the part of local or State interests (H. Doc. No. 985); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Suisun Bay Channel, from Martinez to Antioch, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 986); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

3. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William S. Boyd v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 987); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Samuel Fallows v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 988); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Nelson D. Curtis v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 989); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Dacey E. Stockham, widow of David M. Stockham, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 990); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Eva A. Ingersoll, widow of Robert G. Ingersoll, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 991); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Charles A. Stocksdales, son and sole heir of Sidney A. Stocksdales, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 992); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Margaret Eichorn, administratrix of the estate of Charles Obst, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 993); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Jefferson Good v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 994); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William Poe, son of William Poe, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 995); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WINGO, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10205) to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 408), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10691) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes as amended, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 411), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11020) to amend and reenact sections 5136, 5137, 5139, 5147, 5172, 5200, 5222, 5230, and 5239 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, accompanied by a report (H. Rept. No. 412), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8424) to provide for the purchase of additional land for the enlargement of the site of the public building at Stamford, Conn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 409), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CROSSER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 289) to provide for the acquisition, ownership, and operation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of all the street railroads located in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 410), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.



## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 11017) to authorize the county of Okanogan, Wash., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Okanogan River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 11018) to regulate the salaries of keepers of lights and lighthouses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11019) to increase the pay of keepers of the Coast Guard during the period of the war; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 11020) to amend and reenact sections 5136, 5137, 5139, 5147, 5172, 5200, 5222, 5230, and 5239 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, favoring a league of nations to safeguard the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, favoring a league of nations to safeguard the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11021) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11022) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Thuma; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11023) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Sandford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 11024) granting an increase of pension to Abel B. Conger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11025) granting an increase of pension to Presley Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 11026) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Harpster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11027) granting an increase of pension to George T. Constable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11028) granting a pension to Edward Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11029) for the relief of John P. Willard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 11030) for the relief of H. D. Field Safe Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 11031) granting an increase of pension to Lyman D. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11032) granting an increase of pension to George Snow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 11033) granting an increase of pension to John L. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 11034) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Thurber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 11035) granting an increase of pension to John R. Holt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11036) granting an increase of pension to Richard Holden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11037) granting a pension to James A. McIntyre; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 11038) granting an increase of pension to Minor M. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 11039) granting an increase of pension to John H. Shaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 11040) granting an increase of pension to John M. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 11041) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 11042) granting an increase of pension to Gus. H. Weber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11043) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Dorsett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 11044) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11045) granting a pension to William H. LeBaron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request) Memorial of the South Point Farm Club, Washington, Mo., urging higher prices for farm products and making other recommendations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York and Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to tax on life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Milwaukee Association of Life Underwriters and Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., asking exemption from taxation of life-insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Fortnightly Literary Club of Indianapolis, Ind., and other clubs of the United States, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of United Irish Societies of Chicago, Ill., favoring freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Boise (Idaho) Commercial Club, favoring passage of Senate bill 313, relative to freight-rate charges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of S. Karpen & Bros., of New York, against passage of H. R. 10591, to regulate sale of goods on installment plan; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolution of the Flatbush Medical Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing S. 3748 and H. R. 9563, giving advanced rank to officers of the Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the New York Moline Plow Co., urging the passage of House bill 9501, providing for the purchase of seed wheat for farmers in the northwestern part of the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the advisory committee of the New York State conference of mayors and other city officials, urging that the rights and privileges covered by patents on the "Imhoff tank" process of sewage disposal be given to cities and municipalities; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of Dr. J. R. Wilson, of Bennington, Vt., favoring bill for the higher rank for medical officers and also dentists; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Barbers' Supply Dealers' Association of America, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of the Lithuanian National Council, praying that Lithuania be separated from Germany and Russia and reinstated among the nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of the First Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, Cal., for the passage of a law to prohibit the manufacture of any kind of food into any kind of alcoholic drink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Rotary Club of Chicago, Ill., favoring continuance of the pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of a citizens' meeting at Sycamore, Ill., favoring prohibition of the liquor traffic; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of William E. Golden, of Chicago, Ill., for reduced fare on railroads for soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Million Population Club, of St. Louis, for the retention of the pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Sandwich (Ill.) Manufacturing Co., opposing the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of the American Wood Preservers' Association, opposing the increase of second-class postage rates in the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the United Irish Societies of Chicago, Ill., favoring freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of voters of Kirkwood, Ill., for the passage of proper legislation prohibiting the use of all food products in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Gerlaw United Presbyterian Church, Gerlaw, Ill., requesting the passage of legislation to prohibit the manufacture of foodstuffs into beer and other alcoholic liquors, and making the Nation bone-dry during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of West Side United Presbyterian congregation, of Monmouth, Ill., requesting legislation to prohibit the use of foodstuffs for the manufacture of beer and other alcoholic liquors, and making the Nation bone-dry during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition for a repeal of the zone rate for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Rhode Island House of Representatives, favoring a league of nations to safeguard the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petitions of County Clare Association of California, by R. Barry, secretary; John McBryde Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, by M. Gaul, president; Ladies' Auxiliary to the Connaught Social and Benevolent Association, by Mary M. Roddy, secretary, favoring Rankin resolution No. 204, for Irish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, by J. J. Leveney, secretary; Division No. 10, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, by M. J. Giles, secretary; Division No. 12, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, by P. J. Mahoney, secretary, favoring Rankin resolution No. 204, for Irish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Newport County Medical Society, urging the passage of the Dyer bill, giving advanced rank to officers in the Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution of the United Irish Societies of Chicago, asking that Ireland may be made an independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Mrs. C. S. Thorp and 11 citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., against intemperance; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, against tax on life insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the Rhode Island Fish and Game Protective Association, favoring the passage of the migratory treaty bird law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of members of the Larimer County Medical Society, favoring bill for higher rank for medical officers in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of the Employers' Association of the Lower Naugatuck Valley, Derby, Conn., favoring amendment to revenue bill relative to payment of excess profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of J. S. Miller, pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church, and 70 other citizens of Wimbledon, N. Dak., praying for national prohibition; also a resolution of the same import by the congregation and pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church, of Harvey, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we know that every part of human activity leads to Thy throne; that to think out the problem of life is to think back to Thee. Thou art still the ruler of the universe. Thou dost still sit in judgment upon the conduct of men. We come to Thee in the midst of the Nation's alarm, in the midst of the great crisis that is upon us, and pray Thee, O God of our fathers, Thou who didst establish us, Thou who didst give inspiration to the founders of this Government to erect a government upon the principles of Thy revealed Word, to hear us this day. Give success to our arms. Lead us to victory. May brute force and hate not prevail over justice and truth and right. Grant, we pray, that the outcome of it all shall be for the glory of Thy name and the permanent establishment of a real peace and brotherhood in all the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

## NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1918.

To the SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSIAH O. WOLCOTT, a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. WOLCOTT thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. THOMAS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. ANTHONY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SIMS, Mr. RAYBURN, and Mr. WINSLOW managers at the conference on the part of the House.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer:

S. 1546. An act to permit the use of certain refined products of petroleum as stores on steam vessels carrying passengers;

S. 3129. An act to provide for the disposition of the effects of deceased persons in the naval service;

S. 3130. An act to amend section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3445. An act to authorize the payment of gun pointers and gun captains while temporarily absent from their regular stations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9571. An act to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9903. An act to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents; and

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hillsdale, Wyo., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CURTIS presented resolutions adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, at a quarterly meeting held at Topeka, Kans., relative to the cost of production of wheat and the price the farmer receives as compared with other commodities, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Haven, Guilford, New Haven, and Rocky Hill, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Guilford Branch of the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, of Guilford, Conn., and a memorial of the Litchfield Branch of the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, of Litchfield, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of a Federal suffrage amendment, which were ordered to lie on the table.